Black Slaveowners

Free Black Slave Masters in South Carolina, 1790–1860

Larry Koger

McFarland

Black Slaveowners

Free Black Slave Masters in South Carolina, 1790–1860

Larry Koger

McFarland

Black Slaveowners

Black Slaveowners

Free Black Slave Masters in South Carolina, 1790–1860

by Larry Koger

McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers
Jefferson, North Carolina, and London

Library of Congress Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

Koger, Larry, 1958–
Black slaveowners.

Includes index.
1. Afro-American slaveholders—South Carolina—History. 2. Slavery—South Carolina—History.
3. Slavery—South Carolina—Condition of Slaves.
4. Afro-Americans—Employment—South Carolina—History—19th century. 5. South Carolina—Race relations.
I. Title.
E445.S7K64 1985 975.7'00496073 84-43203

ISBN 0-89950-160-5

©1985 Larry Koger. All rights reserved.

Printed in the United States of America

McFarland Box 611 Jefferson NC 28640

To my parents and Rhudine Johnson

Acknowledgments

Historical research is often stimulated by a provocative question; such was the case for me. As a bright-eyed undergraduate at the University of the District of Columbia, I was exasperated by a multitude of questions resulting from my discovery that free Afro-Americans owned slaves. Who were these black masters, and why did they acquire slaves? Under the guidance of Dr. David Lewis, I attempted to unravel the mystery. It was in Professor Lewis' seminar course that my first inquiries were made and subsequently answered in the paper, "Free Blacks as Slaveowners in America, 1650-1850." Without the initial inspiration provided by Dr. Lewis, this book would have been impossible.

Indeed, the seminar taught by Professor Lewis prompted an investigation which lasted five years. It was at Howard University that I improved my methods and asked more sophisticated questions. I am deeply indebted to Professor Thomas J. Davis, who read my graduate papers on the black slaveowners of South Carolina, and Martha S. Putney, who read the chapter "No More Black Massa." Their insights were extremely beneficial. In addition, a word of thanks must go to Walter Hill, a graduate student at Maryland University. Walter led me to make the connection linking the African-born slavers in Guinea and Sierra Leone with the free black masters of South Carolina.

I am also appreciative of the assistance and cooperation provided by the staffs of the Library of Congress, Manuscript Division; the National Archives, Genealogy and Manuscript Divisions; the Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina; the South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina; the South Carolina Historical Society, Charleston; Robert Small Library, College of Charleston; and the Moorland-Spingarn Research Center, Howard University.

Finally, I am especially grateful to my aunt, Rhudine Johnson, who provided me with lodging and conversation during three summers of research in Columbia, South Carolina. Without her support, my investigation would have been intolerable.

Larry Koger

Washington, D. C.

August 31, 1985

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments vii

List of Tables xi

Foreword xiii

Introduction 1

Chapter One. Free Black Slaveholding and the Federal Census 5

Chapter Two. The Numbers and Distribution of Black Slaveholding 18

Chapter Three. From Slavery to Freedom to Slaveownership 31

Chapter Four. "Buying My Chidrum from Ole Massa" 45

Chapter Five. Neither a Slave Nor a Free Person 69

Chapter Six. The Woodson Thesis: Fact or Fiction? 80

Chapter Seven. White Rice, White Cotton, Brown Planters, Black Slaves 102

Chapter Eight. Free Black Artisans: A Need for Labor 140

Chapter Nine. The Denmark Vesey Conspiracy: Brown Masters vs. Black Slaves 160

Chapter Ten. No More Black Massa 187

Appendix A. Tables for Chapter One 201

Appendix B. Table for Chapter Two 209

Appendix C. Tables for Chapter Six 231

Notes 235

Index 275

List of Tables

1.1. Percentage of Free Black Slaveowners and Slaveholding Heads of Family Recorded on the Federal Censuses with State and Local Records Demonstrating Slaveownership in Charleston City, South Carolina, 1830-1860 9

2.1. Number of Free Black Slaveowners and Slaveholding Heads of Family in South Carolina, 1790-1860 20

2.2. Number of Slaves Held by Free Black Slaveowners and Slaveholding Heads of Family in South Carolina, 1790-1860 21

2.3. Percentage of South Carolina Free Black Slaveowners and Slaveholding Heads of Household Residing in Charleston City, 1790-1860 22

2.4. Percentage of Female Black Slaveowners and Heads of Slaveholding Households in Charleston City, South Carolina, 1820-1864 24

2.5. Age and Sex Distribution of the Slaves Held by Free Blacks in Charleston City, South Carolina, 1850 26

2.6. Age and Sex Distribution of Slaves Held by Free Blacks in the Rural Counties of South Carolina, 1850 28

7.1. Profits, Losses, and Returns for the Santee Plantation in Georgetown County, South Carolina, 1849 123

7.2. Profits, Losses, and Returns for Robert Michael Collins' Plantation in Georgetown County, South Carolina, 1859 125

7.3. Production Figures for the Ellison Plantation in Sumter County, South Carolina, 1849-1861 137

Foreword

In South Carolina, free Negro masters were similar to white slaveowners. Both exploited the labor of slaves with the desire for profits. Quite often, the colored artisans bought slaves who were employed in their trades. Others bought slaves to be hired out and then kept the wages of their bondsmen. They also established a master-slave relationship which demanded subservience from their slaves. The documents I have examined showed Negro masters selling rebellious slaves or placing disobedient bondsmen in the local jail or the workhouse.

Yet black slaveholding had a benevolent side. Black folk labored for years to purchase the freedom of family members who were slaves to white masters. Still others acquired the freedom of beloved friends.

The survey of the local documents could not demonstrate the dominance of the benevolent or kinship aspect of black slaveowning. Indeed, the census of 1850 demonstrated that 83.1 percent of the Negro masters were mulattoes, while nearly 90 percent of their slaves were of dark skin. Where was the kinship? Since mulattoes primarily married mulattoes, the black folk owned by light-skinned Afro-Americans were seldom kin and were overwhelmingly held as laborers. By and large, Negro slaveowners were darker copies of their white counterparts.

Introduction

Black slaveholding is a historical phenomenon which has not been fully explored by scholars. Graduate students of history are often surprised to learn that some free blacks owned slaves. Even historians are frequently skeptical until they discover the number of black masters and the number of slaves owned by them. To many readers, slavery was an institution exclusively utilized by white slaveowners. The fact that free blacks owned slaves has been lost in the annals of history.

Yet at one time or another, free black slaveowners resided in every Southern state which countenanced slavery and even in Northern states. In Louisiana, Maryland, South Carolina, and Virginia, free blacks owned more than 10,000 slaves, according to the federal census of 1830.'

Many of the black masters in the lower South were large planters who owned scores of slaves and planted large quantities of cotton, rice, and sugar cane. In 1860, for example, Auguste Donatto, a free colored planter of St. Landry Parish in Louisiana, owned 70 slaves who worked 500 acres of land and produced 100 bales of cotton. About 600 miles to the east of Louisiana in the county of Sumter, South Carolina, William Ellison, a free colored planter, used the labor of 70 slaves to cultivate 100 bales of cotton in 1861. In South Carolina, Robert Michael Collins and Margaret Mitchell Harris used their slaves to till the soil of Santee Plantation and grew 240,000 pounds of rice in 1849. But the majority of the large colored planters lived in Louisiana and planted sugar cane.2 In 1860, Madame Ciprien Ricard and her son Pierre Ricard, free mulattoes of Ibeville Parish, owned 168 slaves. The joint operation of mother and son used the labor of slaves to produce 515 hogsheads of sugar in 1859. Yet not all of the black masters were planters or from the South. In fact, the city of New York had eight black slaveowners who owned 17 slaves in 1830.3 In short, the institution of black slaveowning was widespread, stretching as far north as New York and as far south as Florida, extending westward into Kentucky, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Missouri.

One may ask, where did these free black masters come from? Many of them were former slaves who were manumitted because of their kinship ties to whites, while others were emancipated for

meritorious military duty, faithful service, or saving a life, as well as other reasons. But the majority of the black masters never knew the dehumanization of slavery because they had been born of free black parents. However, the ranks of the slave masters included not only free blacks but also nominal slaves. In many instances, blacks who were not legally emancipated assimilated into the free black community and later became slaveowners. By and large, the community of black masters came from a diverse background which included persons of free and slave status.4

Once freed, the black masters obtained slaves by various methods. Many of the colored slaveowners inherited slaves from black relatives as well as white kinsfolk. A few black masters owned slaves in West Africa and transported their slaves to the New World. But the majority of the black slaveholders used their own industry and worked as artisans, entrepreneurs, and even as unskilled laborers to obtain the capital to buy slaves.'

The acquisition of slaves by Afro-Americans was the result of various factors. Many free blacks bought relatives who were slaves to white masters. Quite often, when marriages occurred between free blacks and slaves, the free spouse attempted to buy the freedom of the slave spouse and the children. Also, marriages between slaves occasionally saw one spouse emancipated while the other remained in bondage. Consequently, the former slave tried to obtain the liberty of loved ones in servitude.

Some of the slave purchases were caused not by the bond of kinship but by humanitarianism. Free blacks of benevolent persuasion sometimes used their own money to purchase slaves with the intent of emancipating them. However, many black masters did not intend to manumit their slaves and viewed the institution of slavery as a source of labor to be exploited for their own benefit. Indeed, free blacks not only used the labor of slaves to till the soil of their farms and plantations but also purchased slaves to work in their businesses as skilled and unskilled laborers. Others bought slaves to be hired out. These black masters hired out their slaves to non-slaveowners and appropriated the proceeds from the labor of slaves to help support themselves. Whatever the reasons may have been to stimulate free blacks to acquire slave property, the system of American slavery was a universal institution in which even Afro-Americans became slaveowners and occasionally ascended to the ranks of large slaveowning planters.6

Because the history of black slaveholding has been almost

ignored by scholars, the literature on the slaveholding of free blacks is lacking in quantity. Most of the studies examining black slaveowning are written in the form of articles, although numerous other works mention the existence of black masters. So far as the author is aware, the subject of black slaveholding has not been explored on a general or a statewide level in a monograph. Such studies are needed, and it is hoped that this book will, so far as South Carolina is concerned, supply this need.

Although South Carolina may not have been the typical Southern state where free blacks owned slaves, it provided the unique setting of being the bridge between the Upper and the Deep South, thus embracing elements of both societies. In the Palmetto State, there were blacks who owned scores of slaves and large tracts of land like the black slaveowners of Louisiana. Primarily, however, South Carolina's black masters were small slaveholders who owned one or two slaves, like the black slaveowners of Maryland and Virginia. Many of these small slaveholders owned family members who could not be emancipated because the state legislatures prohibited private manumission unless the freed slave left the state.

This book is a study of black slaveholders who were diverse in background and character. Many of the black slaveowners of South Carolina were former slaves who rose from the shackles of bondage to the ranks of slave masters. Still others were one or two generations removed from slavery, and their parents and grandparents were slave masters who passed their human chattel from parent to child. Yet the ranks of the colored masters were not all from the elite class of black society. In the Palmetto State, free blacks who worked as draymen, stable keepers, and washerwomen acquired the money to purchase slaves. Within the community of slaveholders, there were free blacks who bought slaves for humanitarian reasons and broke the laws of South Carolina to maintain the freedom they granted their slaves. Yet black slaveholding in South Carolina was primarily a commercial venture, and the attitudes and actions of colored masters appeared to be similar to those of the white slaveowners. In essence, free black masters embraced many of the attitudes of the white community even while they remained on the fringe of the society.

Chapter One

Free Black Slaveholding and the Federal Census

One of the most important sources which can be used to examine free black slaveholding is the federal census. The federal enumeration gives not only the number of free black slaveholders but also the number of slaves held by the black masters. Yet despite the historical usefulness of the census, such documents present the historian with many problems, particularly when the phenomenon of black slaveowning is explored. Since the early federal enumerations were no more than crude censuses, an accurate depiction of the size or significance of free black slaveowning cannot be obtained without supplementing the original census returns with other documents. Only then can a realistic view be obtained.

The enumerations from 1790 to 1810 recorded only free black heads of household, the number of free members, and the number of slaves living in the residence. For the historian, the federal censuses from 1790 to 1810 provide only such basic information as the names of free black heads of household and the number of free persons and slaves.'

By 1820 the federal censuses were refined and inquiries were added, although the procedures were not drastically altered. As well as recording the number of free members and slaves in the household of free blacks, the 1820 census also listed in various columns the sex and age groupings of the free inhabitants and slaves. Four columns listed age groups of under 15, 15-26, 26-45, and over 45 years of age. By 1830 the federal census was increased from four age categories to six. Yet the censuses from 1820 to 1840 provided only rudimentary information such as the names of heads of household, the number of free colored persons, and the number of slaves, along with their sex and age groupings.'

However, the format of the enumeration went through a dramatic change in 1850. The seventh enumeration was divided into six schedules which incorporated a very elaborate system of inquiry. The schedule of free inhabitants, for example, recorded the names of individual family members and other occupants of the household as well as their race, sex, and age. But the census enumerators were also required to record more detailed information. For instance, the first

schedule of 1850 listed the occupation of male and female dwellers as well as the value of real estate that they owned. Perhaps more importantly, the seventh enumeration recorded individual slaveowners. According to the instructions given to the federal census marshals and their assistants, the names of slaveowners were to be listed in the slave schedule along with the number of slaves, their sex, complexion, and age. If there were several owners to a slave or slaves, the name of just one of the owners would be entered on the schedule. When the slaves were owned by a corporation or trust estate, the name of the corporation or trustee was to be recorded. In addition to the free inhabitant and slave schedules, there were four other schedules: mortality, agriculture, industry, and social statistics.' In general, the federal enumerations provide an array of statistical information to be compiled and analyzed, but the information can be misleading.

For example, statistics on the number of free black heads of household owning slaves can be deceiving when compiled from the federal enumerations from 1790 through 1840. The problem stems from the fact that slaves recorded in family dwellings were occasionally held by more than one member of the free household. As a result, the number of slaveowners might have been greater, while the average number of slaves held would have been smaller. Such numerical statistics, then, must be stated with much caution.

The free black heads of household who were reported with slaves on the 1790 through 1840 censuses should not be referred to as individual slaveowners unless added data has been acquired to suggest ownership of slaves. In several instances, the black heads of household listed as having slaves in their dwellings were not the actual owners, but merely the heads of household, while other free black residents were the legal slaveowners. In 1840, for example, Anthony Weston a free black of Charleston Neck, was reported as the head of a household which included eight slaves; however, the legal owner of the slaves was not Anthony Weston, but his wife, Maria Weston, who recorded six bills of sale for nine slaves between 1833 and 1840.' One can see that to infer slaveownership solely from a single census return and without added evidence can be quite misleading.

Leonard P. Curry, author of The Free Black in Urban America 1800-1850, observes the possibility "that some or all of the slaves residing in a free black family were held by white owners but were permitted to make their own living arrangements and boarded with free Negro families."' If his observation is correct, it would diminish the number of black households which held slaves and the number of

slaves living in the free black dwellings as well as further reducing the reliability of the census. According to Curry, the federal census marshals did not make the distinction between slaveowning and slave-boarding free blacks; therefore, what apparently suggests slaveownership may not be accurate.

Leonard P. Curry's concerns about the procedures with which the federal census marshals recorded the census returns must be examined more closely. Instructions given to the enumerators required them to record the number of slaves living in a family dwelling as well as to report slaveownership. However, the instructions conferred to the federal census marshals were not always precisely followed, so it seems conceivable that several of the slaves held by free black households were boarding with them and not owned by free blacks. But the Act of 1806 stipulated that slaves living outside of their master's household must have tickets or written permission from their owners. The statute also made it illegal to rent directly to a slave any lot, house, or enclosure.6 It seems unlikely that the white community of Charleston City, which was fearful of a possible slave rebellion and associated slave discontent with free blacks, would have permitted so many free black heads of household-more than two out of three-to have a total of more than 1,000 slave boarders, just eight years after the Denmark Vesey slave plot, which was organized by a free black man. In addition, during the secession crisis, when the loyalty of free blacks was being questioned, only 16 free black families had slave boarders, according to Claudia Dale Goldin's analysis of the Charleston City Census of 1861.' The small number of slave boarders implies that the trend away from boarding was established much earlier, perhaps as a result of the Denmark Vesey slave plot. Consequently, slave boarding was not a major factor in the free black community and cannot account for the majority of recorded slaveholding among free blacks in Charleston City. On the whole, the paranoia of the white community did not allow the vast majority of free black heads of household to have many slave boarders for fear of collaboration which would have led to a possible slave rebellion.

Interestingly, black slaveownership did not represent a threat to the safety of the white community. Edwin C. Holland, a leading Charleston literary figure during the 1820s, remarked that most of the mulattoes of Charleston City owned "slaves themselves and are, therefore, so far interested in this species of property, as to keep them on watch and induce them to disclose any plans that may be injurious to our peace."' Holland's belief that free black slave masters served a useful purpose to the white community was shared by other white

citizens. In 1835, the editor of the Charleston Courier defended the right of the free black to own slaves on the grounds that "his right to hold slaves gives him a stake in the institution of slavery and makes it his interest as well as his duty to uphold it. It identifies his interests and his feelings in this particular with those of the white population 9

Furthermore, free blacks who held family members as slaves could not afford to become involved in any slave uprising or any overt opposition to the institution of slavery for fear that if they were discovered their slave relations could be confiscated and sold. By and large, whether free blacks owned slaves as laborers or as family members, they did not pose an immediate threat to the institution of slavery. Nevertheless, the white community probably prevented most free blacks from taking slave boarders.

If slave boarding cannot be considered a valid explanation for free black heads of household with slaves, the opposite is true for slave hiring. A few scholars have suggested that the federal census did not distinguish between slaveowning and slave hiring. According to a small group of historians, the census returns of 1850 and 1860 cannot be used to determine slaveownership because of the prevalence of slave hiring in Charleston City. One scholar chooses to refer to the slaveholders recorded on the slave schedules as "slave users and owners. "10 It is true that several free blacks used the labor of hired slaves as well as hiring out their own slaves to prospective users. For example, Nancy Emanuel, a free black of Charleston City, hired a slave woman named Diana for $2.50 per month in September 1825. In 1826, Helen Inglis, a free mulatto woman, hired a slave named Mosley to work in her business on Ellery Street for $3.50 per month. In 1841, Jacob Weston, a free mulatto and a tailor of Charleston City, used the labor of a slave named Henry Devand in his tailor shop on Queen Street. Weston later purchased the slave in January 1842 for $700.11 However, the dilemma confronted is not whether free blacks hired slaves but whether the federal census marshals distinguished between slaveowners and slave hirers.

An effective method to determine the reliability of the federal census in regard to slaveownership is that of cross-checking the enumeration returns with local records. Among the state and local records which are best suited to determine slaveownership are tax returns. But the tax lists do not span a long period of time and can be used only in certain counties. The tax list of 1824 provides information on the ownership of human chattel; however, it does not include a complete record of Charleston City. Nevertheless, other state

and local records can be used to determine slaveownership. Among these records are bills of sale, church directories, guardian and trustee returns, inventories, newspapers, and wills. Such documents stipulated slaveownership, and in most cases the races of the slaveowners were revealed. However, these records were not intended to record all of the slaveowners as were the tax lists. With the exception of the tax documents, the state and local records mentioned provide only a partial listing of the free black slaveowners because most of the slave masters did not report their slave transactions.

A cross-check made with the aforementioned records will determine what percentage of free black slaveowners recorded on the federal census had documents which proved their ownership of slaves. Since the majority of free black masters lived in Charleston City, the cross-check shown in Table 1.1 has been made in that city.

As previously stated, the tax records are by far the most precise source to determine slaveownership. Table 1.1 reflects the accuracy of the tax lists and the federal census in proving the ownership of slaves by free blacks. When the cross-check was made using the tax records of 1859 and 1860, only four black slaveowners listed by the federal census marshals as slave master did not appear on the tax lists. Without the benefit of the tax lists, the cross-checks between 1830 and 1850 demonstrated that an average of 24.5 percent of the free black slaveholders listed by the federal census marshals had documents to prove their ownership of slaves. But the high accuracy exhibited by the federal enumeration of 1860 strongly suggests that the earlier census returns were just as accurate. Consequently, the census of Charleston City can be used to demonstrate slaveownership rather than slave boarding or slave hiring.

Yet the federal census is plagued by one major problem, which is an undercount of the residents. As with all censuses, the federal enumeration of 1860 failed to report the presence of all its people. Furthermore, the problem of undercounting appears to be more prevalent among free persons of color rather than among the white citizens of Charleston City, and the under-representation of Charleston's free black community was common to all its social and economic groups. For that reason, the census returns cannot be considered a complete account of free coloreds or free colored slaveowners.

A comparison of the eighth federal census with the tax list of 1860 clearly shows that the number of free black slaveowners reported by the federal census marshals was vastly underestimated.

For example, 79 (62.2 percent) of the black slaveowners reported on the tax list of 1860 appeared on the eighth federal census. Of the 79 slaveowners recorded on the tax list and the federal enumeration, only 46 (58.2 percent) of the slaveowners reported to the federal census marshals that they were slave masters, while 33 (41.8 percent) chose not to inform the federal enumerators that they were slaveowners.

Table 1.1. Percentage of Free Black Slaveowners and Slaveholding Heads of Family Recorded on the Federal Censuses with State and Local Records Demonstrating Slaveownership in Charleston City, South Carolina, 1830–1860

1830	1840	1850	1860
25.3%	22.4%	23.6%	92.0%

Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Census of the United States, 1830, 1840, 1850, 1860: Schedule I do 11, South Carolina; List of the Tax Payers of the City of Charleston for 1859, 1860; Bills of Sale 1825-1863 (Secretary of State); Inventories 1820-1863 (Charleston County); Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records (Charleston County); Record of Wills 1825-1865 (Charleston County).

One reason for blacks' not reporting their ownership of slaves was their kinship ties to their human chattel. For example, John Morris, a free black and a wheelwright of Charleston City, purchased his two daughters, Rosana and Carolina, from Josiah A. Payne for $300 in 1849. After Morris bought his two girls, he purchased his wife, Grace, and their son Joseph from William Bee for $500 in 1851. Rather than tell the census taker that his wife and children were slaves, he simply stated that his loved ones were free blacks. According to the eighth federal enumeration, Morris' household consisted of his wife, Grace Morris, and their four children, Rosana, Carolina, Joseph, and Peter Morris. Although he reported his family as free persons of color, he still paid the city taxes for five slaves. Like John Morris, some other free blacks refused to consider or refer to their family members as slaves. As a result, few of these colored slaveholders told the federal census marshals that their kinsfolk were slaves.' 2

If the under-representation of 1860 was typical, then the early census returns may have excluded as many as one half of the free black slaveowners in Charleston City. By and large, while the federal enumerations can serve as an excellent source to demonstrate slaveownership, they do not adequately calculate the number of free black slaveowners and their slaves in Charleston City.

As we leave the confines of Charleston City and enter into the rural areas of South Carolina, the census returns become difficult to interpret. In the back country, free blacks occasionally resided on plantations and farms which had white owners. It was not unusual for free blacks to work on plantations and farms as slave drivers and overseers. Consequently, when the white owners left their estates during the summer season to escape the dreaded fever, or when they were simply absentee planters, their free black slave drivers and overseers were left in charge of the estates. Also there were free black artisans, tenant farmers, and former slaves living on the estates owned by white planters and farmers without any white presence on the premises. So when the federal census marshals reported the returns for plantations and farms where only free blacks and slaves lived, they did not always record the white owners among the current tenants. However, the federal census takers recorded the names of the white owners as the heads of household. Even though the white owners were thus reported, the census returns implied that the free black tenants were not only the heads of household but slaveowners. Since the households had a combination of free blacks and slaves, the logical deduction would be to consider the free black occupants as slaveowners.

An example of another sort of confusion is found in the 1840 census, which reported that Elias Collins and Frederick Rutledge were heads of household, with free colored persons and slaves living in the dwelling. The information reported by the enumerators implied that both men were free blacks and slaveowners, but that was true only for Elias Collins. According to the tax list of 1824, he was a free black and the owner of 37 slaves. Furthermore, he stated in his last will and testament that he was a free person of color living in Georgetown County. Frederick Rutledge, however, was of Caucasian descent. Both of his parents, Frederick Rutledge and Harriet Pinckney Horry, were of English heritage. The 1860 census reported that Rutledge was a white planter of St. James Santee Parish." In short, a man who appears in the records to be a free black slaveowner was in fact a white absentee slaveowner whose estate was devoid of any white presence. The dilemma of distinguishing between white absentee slaveowners and free black slaveowners was a major problem outside of Charleston City. Many of the large slaveowners who appeared to be free blacks were actually white absentee slaveowners and planters like Frederick Rutledge.

Another problem occurred when colored slaveowners hired white overseers or had other whites residing on their estates. The federal census marshals recorded the names of the heads of household,

but when a combination of free blacks and whites lived on the plantations, the natural inference would be to classify the owner of the estate as white, assigning the free black resident to the role of tenant. For instance, Elias Collins was reported to be the owner of 34 slaves by the federal enumerator of the fourth census. His household had a combination of free blacks, slaves, and a white male over 45 years old.14 After a careful examination of the census return for Elias Collins, the logical deduction would be that Collins was the white male living in the household, the head of the family and a slaveowner. However, that observation is erroneous. In a cross-check of the census return with state and local documents, the deduction that Elias Collins was a white planter cannot be substantiated; rather, the crosscheck firmly demonstrates that he was a free person of color and a slaveowner.

Occasionally the estate was owned by a free black absentee slaveowner. For example, Daniel Eady, a colored farmer of St. John's Berkeley, was reported as the head of a household that included only white females and slaves in 1810." Once again the census returns could be interpreted to suggest that Daniel Eady was white. But in his last will and testament, he declared that he was "a free coloured man of St. Johns Berkeley...."16 Clearly, the census returns which report a sole white male or his family residing on a plantation with slaves do not always prove that the owner was white. By and large, the federal census returns from 1790 to 1840 outside of Charleston City must be cross-checked with state and local documents to ensure an accurate inference.

Carter G. Woodson, in "Free Negro Owners of Slaves in the United States in 1830" clearly misinterpreted the federal census of 1830. Although Woodson and his associates accurately recorded individual households which had free blacks and slaves living in the dwellings, he mistakenly concluded that the heads of household were free blacks and slaveholders.

Woodson's conclusions eliminated the possibility that some of the dwellings had white absentee heads of household, yet such was sometimes the case. For example, in 1830, Thomas F. Caper of St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish was reported by the federal census marshal as the head of a household which included free blacks and slaves. Based on that report, Woodson concluded that Caper was a free black and a slaveowner. Yet the local records demonstrate that Thomas F. Caper was a white planter of Charleston City. In the Directory of Charleston City for 1830, he was listed as a resident of the city living on 44 Meeting Street. Also, in 1850, he was reported as

a white person and a broker living in Ward Two. In many instances, the planters of Charleston District lived in the city while they hired overseers to manage their estates and occasionally their overseers happened to be free blacks." In summary, Woodson's analysis of the federal census of 1830 failed to distinguish between free black slaveowners and white absentee planters, and several of the slaveowners that Woodson classified as free blacks were, in fact, white absentee slaveowners."

Even when the state or local records acknowledged that a slave master was a mulatto, the statement of race was not always reflected in the census. Many of the federal census takers were often confused by the light complexion of free mulattoes and occasionally classified them as whites. In 1850, for example, William Clarke and his family were reported as white by the census taker of Charleston City, but that same year, the city tax collector listed them as free persons of color. Furthermore, the rector of St. Michael's Church listed William B. Clarke and his wife, Frances A. Clarke, as mulattoes when the couple had their child baptized in 1842.19 Clearly the problem of distinguishing between mulattoes and whites befuddled many census enumerators who did not know how to categorize mulattoes. To add to the dilemma, the authorities of South Carolina refused to establish a fractional criterion to define the blackness or the whiteness of their mulattoes. Many prominent whites were fearful that an attempt to define the term mulatto might push too many persons over the wrong side of the color line. So there was no legal definition of the term mulatto by the state legislature, and the problem of distinguishing between mulattoes and whites became a matter for the courts to determine.20

In 1831, Judge William Harper delivered the opinion of the Court of Appeals in a case involving the blackness or whiteness of a mulatto. Judge Harper declared that "we cannot say what admixture of negro blood will make a colored person.... The condition of the individual is not to be determined solely by distinct and visible mixture of negro blood, but by reputation by his reception into society and his having commonly exercised the privileges of a white man ... it may be well and proper, that a man of worth, should have the rank of a white man while a vagabond of the same degree of blood should be confined to the inferior cast."" In essence, Judge Harper's decision allowed the white community to determine who was to be considered as a mulatto or a white. With the conditions for the elevation of free mulattoes to the status of white citizens resting upon their wealth, conduct, and more importantly, their whiteness of skin, the door to

the white world was kept judiciously open for a few mulattoes. And a small number of mulattoes came through the door and crossed the racial barriers, thus entering the world of whiteness in South Carolina.

The decision of Judge William Harper merely reflected the methods by which race was determined in the past. During the colonial period, the white community did not seem particularly adverse to absorbing the lightskinned mulattoes of wealth into the white caste. For example, the children of Gideon Gibson, a free mulatto, passed into the world of the dominant caste without much ado. Gibson, a carpenter and a slaveowner, migrated from Virginia to South Carolina in 1731. Once entering the state, he established himself and several white females in his family along the Santee River country on the frontier of South Carolina. By the 1730s, he began to acquire land and later slaves. As his wealth grew the status of his family began to change. For instance, his daughter, a product of an interracial union, married an English settler named George Saunders. After the death of Saunders, she remarried to one of the wealthiest white men in the area.22

The oldest son of Gideon Gibson was accepted into the white community. In fact, Gideon Gibson, Jr., became a leader in the Regulator Movement, which was a spontaneous uprising of vigilante groups orga nized to suppress the frontier robbers in 1765. Some years later, as his respect within the white community grew, he was considered a white man by most of his fellow citizens.23 However, not all of the white citizens accepted Gibson as a white man. On the floor of the state assembly, one legislator verbally attacked Gibson and called for the withdrawal of his rights as a white citizen on the grounds that he was a Negro. Fortunately for Gibson's sake, Henry Laurens, a merchant and political leader of Charleston, openly challenged Gibson's critics to compare the red and white associated with the Englishness of his face with that of the average member of the assembly of French Huguenot ancestry. Needless to say, the debate concerning the ancestry of Gibson came to an abrupt conclusion. The experience of the Gibson family was not an isolated event, particularly among the mulatto slaveowners and planters.20

The process of assimilation can be seen in the recollections of Duke de la Rouchefoucault Liancourt during his travels of 1794. He recalled that a free Negro man named Pindiam was so successful that he was able to break the racial barriers. According to the French traveler, Pindiam was an emancipated slave from St. Paul's Parish in Charleston District who rose from slavery to freedom and later acquired a plantation as well as 200 slaves. In spite of his African

blood, Pindiam was so respected in the white community that he married a white woman and several years later gave his mulatto daughter in marriage to a white man. Clearly the wealth of Pindiam appears to be the dominant factor which facilitated his entrance into the white world. If the duke's accounts were accurate, it appears that money could have the effect of whitening the skin of wealthy free blacks.25

And in fact, Duke de la Rouchefoucault Liancourt's recollections were not far from the truth. The individual he referred to as Pindiam was a real person, but his actual name was James Pendarvis. Furthermore, he was a free person of color and a slaveowner from St. Paul's Parish in Charleston District as the duke recalled. According to the 1786 tax list for St. Paul's Parish, he paid taxes on 113 slaves and a plantation which contained 3,250 acres of land. James Pendarvis was married to a white woman, Catherine Rumph Pendarvis, who was the daughter of Peter Rumph, a white planter of St. Bartholomews Parish in Charleston District. And their daughter, as the duke said, married a white man. Actually, they had two daughters, both of whom married into the planter class. Ann Pendarvis was wed to Samuel Perry, and Elizabeth Mary Pendarvis married a planter named Thomas Smith, Jr. The reminiscences of Duke de la Rouchefoucault Liancourt were astoundingly accurate.26

Yet a few aspects of his accounts were slightly overstated. For example, he overestimated the number of slaves owned by James Pendarvis. According to the first federal census, Pendarvis owned 123 slaves and not 200 slaves as the duke reported in his book. Furthermore, the federal enumerator did not refer to James Pendarvis as a free Negro but as a white man. The federal censuses of 1790 and 1800 as well as the tax lists of 1785 and 1786 reported James Pendarvis and his family not as free persons of color but as white persons.

When the federal marshals and the tax collectors reported Pendarvis and his family as white, their observations were inaccurate. In 1735, Joseph Pendarvis, the father of James Pendarvis and a white planter of Colleton County, wrote his last will and testament. He declared that his children, James, Brand, William, John, Thomas, Mary, and Elizabeth, were the offspring of his Negro woman, Parthena. So James Pendarvis as well as his brothers and sisters were born of Afro-Anglo heritage. In other words, they were mulattoes according to English tradition.27 Indeed, the African features displayed by James Pendarvis were so apparent that Duke de la Rouchefoucault Liancourt referred to him as a free Negro and not as a

mulatto. Yet in spite of his noticeable African features, the white community considered him a white person. As he began to prosper, his African ancestry became less of a negative factor, thus facilitating his entrance into the white community.

Judge William Harper's criterion for determining the whiteness of mulattoes will not suffice for historical research. As with James Pendarvis, the issue of race must be determined by documents which specify race. For example, affidavits, church records, city directories, census returns of 1850 and 1860, tax lists, and wills often provide the race of the parties involved when they appear on more than one document over a span of time. When the race of a slaveowner has been reported as a mulatto, in spite of the fact that another document may refer to him or her as white during an earlier or later period, he or she should be considered a free person of color. The reason for considering apparently white slaveowners as mulattoes when documents conflict in regard to race is based on the observation that few whites went around accusing supposed white persons of being Negroes unless there was a grain of truth to the allegations. Since many free mulattoes sought to disavow their African ancestry and use their European heritage to pass into the world of whiteness, there were numerous affidavits recorded in which supposed white persons were challenged to prove their claims of unmixed racial descent. In many instances, the alleged white citizens were mulattoes who chose to cross the racial barriers.

The limitations of being classified as colored caused many mulattoes to gravitate towards the white community, and often times they found white persons to attest to their claims of whiteness. In 1810, Mrs. Martha Hill gave sworn testimony that Mary Ann Ladson was a bonafide white woman.28 In another example, Mary D. Martin testified that she was acquainted with Elizabeth Susan Garden for 40 years. During that period of time, she was a classmate of Mrs. Garden at the school of Mr. Thomas Parker. Although Mrs. Martin was not acquainted with the parents of Mrs. Garden, she maintained that "Elizabeth was received into the School of Mr. Parker as a white person and has always been so regarded ..."29 Mrs. Martin also swore that Elizabeth Susan Garden associated with white persons and was regarded as a white woman by the community. Doctor J.W. Schmidt declared that he had known both Elizabeth Susan Garden and her sister, Rachel Gardiner, since the year 1807 and "regarded them as white persons and entitled to white laws."30

In spite of the affidavits filed by Mary Martin and Doctor Schmidt, Elizabeth Susan Garden and her sister were of African

descent. In fact, they were descendants of one of the oldest free colored families in Charleston City. Their lineage can be traced back through at least two generations of free mulattoes in Charlestown. They were the children of George and Ruth Raper Gardiner, and the grandchildren of William and Susanna Cole Raper. Their father, George Gardiner, was among the few colored artisans in Charlestown during the 1770s, while their grandfather, William Raper, and their great uncle, Thomas Cole, the brother of Susanna Cole Raper, were mulattoes and bricklayers in the port city. The respect that their father and grandfather received as artisans appears to have been extended to the two colored women." Not only were Elizabeth and Rachel respected in the community, but they were regarded as white persons.

Occasionally free mulattoes married the daughters and sons of white persons and were welcomed into white families. For example, the mulatto children of Elijah Bass and his white wife, Milbury Eliza Bass, of Kershaw District, were accepted into the white society with little ado. In spite of the African descent of their father, William, John, and Martha R. Bass were educated as free white persons. Martha R. Bass eventually married a white man, Thomas White. The husband of the colored woman was a well-educated and respected Scotsman who taught in the community school in Kershaw. Like her husband, Martha White also was highly respected. She enjoyed all the rights and privileges of a free white woman and was treated as such by her white neighbors. Furthermore, her brother not only married a white woman but petitioned the courts to legally declare his children to be white persons.

The offspring of Elijah Bass and his wife were extremely fairskinned and appeared to be white. Yet their light complexion was not the only factor which allowed them to assimilate into the white community. Their mulatto father, Elijah Bass, was referred to as a dark quadroon and clearly could not pass for white. However, he was treated by his white neighbors as a white person. Since Bass was a property owner as well as a slaveowner, he shared much in common with his white associates and thus was perceived not as a threat but as an ally by his peers. For that reason, he was not subjected to the state capitation tax which was required of all free black adults between 16 and 55 years old. Furthermore, he broke many of the rules of Southern etiquette which separated blacks from whites.32 For instance, Elijah Bass associated with his white peers as equals and even ate at the same table with his friends.

Such privileges granted to free mulatto slaveowners were not unusual in the Palmetto State. For example, so respected was Elias

William Garden, a mulatto slaveowner of Charleston City, that the local officials bestowed unto him the rights and privileges of a white person in 1843.

> I William B. Heriot a Justice of Quorum and Notary of the Public in the City of Charleston ... certify that ... whereas [Elias William Garden) is well known and ingood refute ... all persons with whom he may sojourn and desire to receive his attestation [should] grant to the said Elias W. Garden, being subject and obedient to the Law, the benefits of common kindness and the rights and privileges of a free white citizen ...33

In spite of the fact that Elias William Garden was accepted by the white community as a citizen, his racial identity was not altered. In the federal census of 1850, he was classified as a mulatto planter living in the household of his mother-in-law, Ann Mitchell. Yet neither Elias W. Garden nor his wife, Henrietta Mitchell Garden, the daughter of James Mitchell and the founder of the Brown Fellowship Society, was required to pay the state capitation taxes demanded from adult free Negroes."

In general, those persons with conflicting documents which state their race were usually free persons of color. As a result of their wealth and fair complexion, they were occasionally accepted as white citizens. Consequently, when the federal census marshals reported the composition of their households, they occasionally listed them as white persons even though the marshals may have been aware of their African ancestry.

It was not unusual for the descendants of mulatto slaveowners as well as the descendants of mulattoes who intermarried with Indians to reject their African ancestry and pass for free Indian. Many mulattoes claimed to be free Indians to escape the limitations of being classified as a free black. Once the free mulattoes were accepted as free Indians by the local authorities, they were exempted from paying the state capitation taxes imposed on the free black community. They also were permitted to give sworn testimony in court litigation concerning the race of their fellow companions who sought to evade the state capitation taxes by proving themselves to be descendants of free Indians."

The prevalence of free mulattoes who evaded the state capitation taxes caused the editor of the Charleston Mercury to complain that

many mulattoes unjustly wriggled out of the free black caste by asserting that they were of Indian blood on their mother's side and thereby exempt from the free Negro taxes. In 1821, for example, Richard and Joseph Dereef were reported to be free mulattoes by the city tax collector and therefore paid the state capitation taxes. Yet the two colored brothers refused to accept their status and petitioned the Court of Common Pleas to regard them as free Indians. On July 11, 1823, they won a court decision which certified them to be the descendants of a free Indian woman. Consequently, the tax collector could not demand that they pay the state capitation taxes. In that same year, John Cain, an alleged free mulatto, was also declared to be a free Indian by the Court of Common Pleas and thereby exempt from the state capitation taxes.

Although some free mulattoes were declared to be of free Indian descent by the courts, they seldom separated themselves from the free mulatto community and often married free mulattoes as well as free blacks. For instance, John Garden, a free mestizo or free Indian, married the mulatto daughter of George Gardiner. In another example, Flora Garden, the mother of John Garden and a free Indian, was wed to Robert Baldwin, a free black man and a house carpenter of Charleston City in 1801.36 To the eyes of the federal census takers, there was little difference between the free Indians and the free mulattoes, and they often confused the two races. Since most of the free Indian population of Charleston City aligned themselves with the free mulatto community, they are here included in the statistics of free colored slaveowners of South Carolina.37

Perhaps the most difficult problem confronted when examining free black slaveholding is determining how much African descent makes a free person of color. In several instances, the descendants of mulatto slaveowners consistently intermarried with white persons and subsequently passed for white. After generations of intermarriage, should the descendants of mulatto slaveowners be classified as free persons of color or as white persons? In 1733, the legislature of Jamaica confronted the problem of the demarcation between mulattoes and whites. According to the legislature, no one would be deemed a mulatto when three generations removed from his Negro ancestor; rather he would be classified as a white person. In South Carolina, there was no law similar to the Jamaican statute. However, in South Carolina, the courts were empowered to draw the line between the two races, and it was usually determined that those between one-fourth and one-eighth Negro ancestry would be considered white persons. For the sake of categorizing that segment of

the slaveholding population, those slaveowners who were three generations removed from their African ancestry will be viewed in this book as white persons and not included among the free black slave masters."

In this volume, the statistics compiled from the federal enumerations have been adjusted to present a more accurate depiction of free black slaveholding. Consequently the statistics include the slaveowners or heads of household who were classified as free persons of color as well as the mulatto slaveowners who were established as white citizens or were misinterpreted as white persons, while excluding those slave masters who were three generations removed from their Negro ancestry. Furthermore, enumerated persons who appeared to be free black slaveowners but were actually white absentee slave master are excluded, while free black absentee slaveowners are included in the free black slaveholding population. These adjustments have been made to provide a more accurate representation of black slaveholding in South Carolina.

Chapter Two

The Numbers and Distribution of Black Slaveholding

On January 1, 1863, President Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation, thus initiating the legal process to free the slaves in the rebelling Southern states and eventually to eliminate chattel slavery in North America. The ramifications of Lincoln's proclamation affected not only thousands of white slave masters but hundreds of black slaveholders. In Charleston City, for example, there were 91 free black masters who owned 268 slaves when President Lincoln signed that historic document. Upon the conclusion of the Civil War, more than 75 black masters in that city were instructed to free their slaves, who numbered 241 bondsmen.

The number of black slaveowners during the war years was a fraction of the total slaveholding community of Afro-Americans over all the slavery years in South Carolina. In 1860, the number of black slave masters was reported to be 171 persons, who held 766 slaves in the state. By 1860 the phenomenon of black slaveholding was declining. In fact, between 1850 and 1860, the number of colored masters decreased by 42.4 percent while the number of slaves declined by 40 percent. Yet before the sixth federal census, free black slaveholding was by no means a diminishing enterprise but a growing trend which peaked in 1840.'

When the first federal census of 1790 was taken, the number of free colored slaveholders was quite small, but it gradually grew to a modest size. In 1790, the community of slaveholding colored persons stood at 59 slave masters who held 357 bondsmen. Within ten years, their numbers had declined to 45 slaveowners; however, the number of slaves held by the colored persons increased to 414. In Charleston City, the number of colored masters was reported at 36 by the census takers of 1790. By the next federal enumeration, the number of urban slave masters had declined to 29. At least part of the decline in slave masters over the decade can be attributed to the fact that many of the black masters owned loved ones as nominal slaves and subsequently emancipated them from the legal bond of slavery; thus the number of slaveholders gradually decreased. Also, many colored persons, such as Peter B. Mathews, bought slaves only to emancipate them and asked nothing in return for their acts of benevolence. In 1790, Mathews, a butcher by trade, owned a black man named Hercules, who was acquired for humanitarian reasons and later emancipated by the

colored man.2

By 1820, the number of colored slaveholders began to grow significantly. Between 1800 and 1820, the number of black masters increased by 411 percent, or an addition of 186 slaveowners. The growth of the community of black slaveholders continued for the next 20 years. Between 1820 and 1830, the community of Afro-Americans who owned slaves increased by 95.6 percent. According to the census of 1830, there were 450 slave masters of African ancestry. By 1840, the number of colored masters came to 454.

The rapid growth in the community of black slaveholders can be attributed to several factors. After 1820, free blacks who purchased kinsfolk or friends could not emancipate their loved ones without the approval of the state assembly, which seldom granted such manumissions. Consequently, the black slaveholders who normally would have freed their slaves were forced to hold their loved ones as chattel and report their kinsfolk as slaves to the census takers. Thus the normal process of decline through manumission was no longer a factor in the state. Furthermore, the period from 1820 to 1840 witnessed the economic development of the free black community. Many persons of color acquired the capital to purchase slaves. These new slaveowners were not related to their slaves by the bond of kinship; they bought slaves to be used as laborers. During the 1830s, Elsey Lee, a free black woman of Charleston Neck, purchased a black family which consisted of a woman named Kitty and her children, John, Ben, and Diana. Sometime after the acquisition, the free black woman hired out her slaves to non-slaveowners and kept the proceeds made by her servants. With the elimination of private manumission and the rise of commercial slaveowning, the number of black masters grew substantially after 1820.3

By 1840, however, the community of black slaveholders was beginning to suffer a decline. Between 1840 and 1850, the community of AfroAmerican slaveowners decreased by 34.5 percent. Most of the reduction occurred in Charleston District, where the majority of the colored slaveowners lived. The largest losses appeared within the community of Charleston Neck, where the number of colored slaveowners decreased by nearly 120 masters, leaving only 58 slaveholders in 1850.

Such dramatic declines were caused by several factors. One reason was that many free blacks who owned slaves refused to inform the census takers of their slave property. For example, Peter Desverneys, a free mulatto of Charleston Neck, did not report his

slave, Laviana Cole Sanders, when the enumerator inquired about the composition of his household in 1850. Yet the female slave had been in the service of the colored man since 1837 and remained under his authority until 1861.4

However, the major reasons for the decline of colored slave masters were the death of several slaveowners and the liquidation of their slave property as well as the pattern of outward migration. In 1840, Edward Logan, a free black of Charleston Neck, owned a girl named Bella. Shortly after his death in 1850, the slave girl was sold by his administrator for $600. Elsewhere in Charleston Neck, Peter H. Merchant was reported by the census taker of 1840 to be the owner of two slaves. Within ten years, he sold the slaves and moved to Colleton District. While some free blacks moved to different parts of the state, others simply left the state and settled in Northern cities. Shortly after Thomas Hanscome purchased a slave named James from the estate of his mother-in-law, Martha Inglis, he left the state and moved to Philadelphia in 1845. Before his departure, he requested that John G. Garden should be given the power to manage his slaves and other investments)

Table 2.1. Number of Free Black Slaveowners and Slaveholding Heads of Family in South Carolina, 1790–1860

District	1790	1800	1810	1820	1830	1840	1850	1860
Abbeville					2	7		
Anderson						1	1	1
Barnwell		1		1		5	4	3
Beaufort	2	2	1	4	6			4
Charleston	49	36	17*	206	407	402	266	137
Chesterfield				1	2	1		
Colleton					8	4	2	3
Edgefield			3		1			2
Fairfield								2
Georgetown		2	7	10		13	10	8
Horry							1	
Kershaw			1	2	5			
Lancaster	1					1		
Lauren				1		1		
Lexington								1
Marion		2	2					
Newberry					8	2		2
Orangeburgh	7	1			1	5	2	2
Pendleton				1				
Picken							2	
Richland					7	11	4	1
Sumter		1	1	4	1	1	4	4
Union								1
Williamsburgh					1			
York					1		1	
Total	59	45	32	230	450	454	297	171

Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, *First through Eighth Censuses of the United States, 1790–1860: Schedule I & II*, South Carolina; *Tax List of Charleston City for 1860.*

*Partial Returns for Charleston District

Between 1850 and 1860, the number of black slaveholders decreased from 297 to 171, which was a loss of 126 slaveowners or a decline of 42 percent. As the Union Army was approaching South Carolina from the state of Georgia, the number of black slaveowners was fewer than 100, and most of them resided in Charleston City.

Table 2.2. Number of Slaves Held by Free Black Slaveowners and Slaveholding Heads of Family in South Carolina, 1790–1860.

District	1790	1800	1810	1820	1830	1840	1850	1860
Abbeville					3	20		
Anderson						1	1	2
Barnwell		I		7		9	24	30
Beaufort	7	2	4	I9	32			24
Charleston	277	315	143*	1030	2195	2001	1087	544
Chesterfield				1	I2	1		
Colleton					II4	87	I9	I2
Edgefield			7		3			5
Fairfield								3
Georgetown		75	82	76		94	79	29
Horry							2	
Kershaw			2	3	9			
Lancaster	2					8		
Lauren				3		6		
Lexington								2
Marion		8	23					
Newberry					18	5		9
Orangeburg	71	1			2	22	6	8
Pendleton				I				
Picken							3	
Richland					17	73	7	5
Sumter		12	5	8	4	30	41	72
Union								21
Williamsburgh					2			
York					1		8	
Total	357	414	266	1148	2412	2357	1277	766

Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, *First through Eighth Censuses of the United States, 1790–1860: Schedule I & II*, South Carolina; *Tax List of Charleston City for 1860.*

*Partial Returns for Charleston District

As the number of black slaveowners dwindled, their slaveholding also declined during the period from 1840 to 1860. In fact, the number of slaves held by black slave masters decreased by 45.8 percent between 1840 and 1850. Ten years later, the slave community had dwindled from 1,277 in 1850 to 766 in 1860. Although much of the decline resulted from the diminishing number of colored masters,

the reduced slaveholding of the black masters was a factor. Several colored masters sold their surplus slaves and kept their most productive bondsmen. Many urban slaveowners did not require the labor of several slaves, and so they gradually decreased the number of slaves they held. In 1848, Louisa R. DaCosta, a free woman of color from Charleston City, sold 21 slaves to George Thompson for $6,635. By 1850 Mrs. DaCosta and her husband, William P. DaCosta, retained the services of ten slaves. Ten years later, the couple held eight slaves, and by 1862 they owned only seven bondsmen. Between 1830 and 1860, the number of colored slaveowners who owned more than five slaves declined from 96 to 23 masters in Charleston City. During that same period of time, the average slaveholding decreased from 4.5 persons in 1830 to 3.1 persons in 1860. Within six months before General Robert E. Lee surrendered at Appomattox, there were at least 500 slaves held by free blacks and the majority of these bondsmen resided in Charleston City.6

For the most part, black slaveholding was an urban phenomenon and dominated the city of Charleston. In fact, the majority of the colored slaveowners lived in the port city from 1850 through 1860.

The prevalence of urban black slaveowners can be attributed to the economic development of the free black caste in Charleston City. Clearly the urban setting provided the colored entrepreneurs with the means to earn a livelihood and prosper. Many free blacks availed themselves of the economic benefits which could be extracted from Charleston City and worked as barbers, bricklayers, carpenters, mantua makers, millwrights, pastry cooks, seamstresses, shoemakers, tailors, and tin plate makers, thereby earning the capital to invest in slave property. From 1810 until 1825, William Penceel, a free mulatto and a tin plate worker from Charleston City, used the proceeds from his trade to purchase slaves. In 1814, for example, Penceel bought an eight-year-old named Stephen from E.M. Logan for $180. Nearly seven years later, he purchased a servant woman named Nancy for $537.50. William Penceel's acquisition of slaves did not cease with the purchase of two slaves but continued into 1823. In that year, he bought Sukey and her children, Thorn and Harriet, for $700. Within nine years, the profits from his trade permitted him to purchase four slaves for a combined sum of $1,417.50. As the economy of Charleston City continued to expand, many free blacks were able to buy slaves and the port city became the center of black slaveholding in South Carolina.'

Table 2.3. Percentage of South Carolina Free Black Slaveowners and Slaveholding Heads of Household Residing in Charleston City, 1790–1860

1790	1800	1810*	1820	1830	1840	1850	1860
61.0%	64.4%		47.1%	57.8%	47.7%	64.3%	71.3%

Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, *Census of the United States, 1790, 1800, 1820, 1830, 1840, 1850, 1860: Schedule I & II*, Charleston City, South Carolina.

*not reported

Indeed, so widespread was black slaveholding in the city of Charleston that the majority of free black heads of household owned slaves from 1820 to 1840. When the first federal census of 1790 was taken, it revealed that 36 out of 102, or 35.2 percent, of the free black heads of family held slaves in Charleston City. By 1800 nearly one out of every three colored heads of household were recorded with slave property. Between 1820 and 1840, the percentage of slaveholding heads of family ranged from 72.1 to 77.7 percent. In 1850, however, the percentage of black heads of household owning slaves was a modest 42.3 percent.

The existence of black slaveholding in Charleston City was so visible that a Northern visitor to the city commented that "a number are free [blacks] and own slaves themselves. This may seem strange to many Northern people especially to that class who cannot understand nor appreciate that system of labor known as slave labor.""

As the free black community prospered, even marginal blacks acquired the means to purchase slaves. In 1854, Rebecca Swinton, a 44-yearold black woman with no reported occupation, somehow obtained the money to purchase a 50-year-old slave named Mary for $100. Elsewhere in Charleston City, Joseph Maxwell, a black fisherman, owned two female slaves whose ages were 38 and 6 years old. In 1850, the only property owned by the majority of the colored masters was human chattel. For the most part, free blacks of wealth as well as those of marginal status acquired slaves and thereby contributed to the high percentage of colored heads of family who owned slaves in Charleston City.9

It appears that throughout most of the antebellum period, the majority of the urban black slaveholders were females. In 1820, for example, free black women represented 68.2 percent of the heads of

family as well as 70.7 percent of the slaveholding heads of colored dwellings.

In Charleston City, the female heads of black families dominated the black slaveholding community. In 1850, the number of black women who owned slaves was reported at 123 by the federal census. Yet only 68 black men owned slaves in the port city. By 1860 the gap between female and male slaveowners gradually decreased, and within four more years the number of male masters surpassed the number of female masters.

The great preponderance of free black women who owned slaves can be attributed to several factors. The combined effects of manumission, inheritance, and personal industry led to the substantial number of female slaveowners. Since black women were the majority of the slaves emancipated, they outnumbered their male counterparts and remained more numerous than free black men during the nineteenth century. Their superiority in numbers was reflected within the slaveholding community of free blacks. As the number of manumissions increased, many new females were added to the free black community and both indirectly and directly influenced the number of female slaveowners.

Without the increasing number of female slaves being emancipated, the community of women slaveholders could not have developed into a dominant force. Yet mere freedom did not guarantee that the freed slaves would be capable of buying human chattel. In many instances, rural emancipators facilitated not only the growth of the free black population but also the number of colored slaveowners because they provided their former servants with slave property. In 1810, John Warren, a white planter from St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish of Charleston District, emancipated his female slave, Judah Warren. Shortly before his death, he requested that Judah Warren should have six slaves, whose names were Jacob, Dick, Isaac, Patty, Pleasant, and Stephen. Usually such conveyances were the result of sexual liaisons which occurred during slavery and continued after the women were freed from bondage. Undoubtedly many of the slaveowning black women owed their freedom and human chattel to white emancipators.10

However, the majority of black women who owned slaves received their property from the inheritance provided by relatives and spouses. In the will of Ruth Cole, she bequeathed the servant girl named Amey to her daughter, Barbara Maria Bampfield. Elsewhere in Charleston City, Richard Moore requested that "the following Negro

slaves ... Maria and her two children named Amelia and George and Hestor also all the Household and Kitchen Furniture belonging to me at the time of my death, In trust Nevertheless to and for the Sole and Separate use ... of my Daughter Ann Forrest formerly Ann Moore." In the same will, he gave his second daughter, Mary Brown, three slaves named Silva, Rachel, and Andrew. Many colored slaveowners bequeathed slaves to their children so that their offspring could have a means of supporting themselves by hiring out the slaves to non-slaveowners.I I

Table 2.4. Percentage of Female Black Slaveowners and Heads of Slaveholding Households in Charleston City, South Carolina, 1820–1864

1820	1830	1840	1850	1860	1862	1863	1864
70.7%	69.2%	70.9%	64.3%	51.6%	50.4%	48.3%	58.0%

Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Census of the United States, 1820, 1830, 1840, 1850: Schedule !& 1!, Charleston City, South Carolina; J.R. Honour, List of the Tax Payers of the City of Charleston for 1860 (Charleston: Walker & Evans, 1861), pp.315-334; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1862, 1863, 1864 (Charleston).

Many black women inherited their slaves from the belongings of their husbands. When Jacob Kochler, a colored butcher of Charleston City, died in the possession of six slaves (Sella, Lizzy, Mary, Jacob, Selina, and Mary), his wife, Mary Kochler, who was the closest heir, appropriated the slave property, which was valued at $2,530.12 Since the mortality rate among black men appeared to be somewhat greater than within the female population, many black women inherited slaves from their husbands. The federal census recorded many black women who were without spouses but who owned slave property which may have been inherited from their spouses and was used to support themselves. In May of 1852, for example, the husband of Charlotte Carmand died at the age of 31 years and left her with two small children. Upon the death of her husband, the 27-year-old colored widow inherited a servant girl named Rebecca, who was hired out. In another example, Elias W. Garden, a mulatto planter of Charleston City, died after a long illness at the age of 37 years. He also left a wife, Henrietta R. Garden, and five children. Yet Elias W. Garden

provided his wife with at least eight slaves, three of whom were sold to support the family. By and large, the slave property inherited by free black women attributed to the growth of black slaveholding within the female population of Charleston City."

Not all of the slaveowning black females acquired slaves upon the death of a spouse. Many colored women purchased slaves by their own industry. These black women worked as pastry cooks, seamstresses, and even as washerwomen. For instance, Rebecca Jackson washed the clothing of many citizens from Charleston City and saved enough money to buy slaves. In 1818, the colored woman purchased a black girl who probably was used to help in the washing of her clients' laundry." Upon her death, Rebecca Jackson was reported as the owner of three slaves, Rose, Molly, and Martha, who were appraised at $1,900.

Throughout the antebellum period, free black women purchased slaves in South Carolina. In 1824, Margaret Kelly bought a black man named John for $1,200. Nearly ten years later, Jane Wightman bought a black male who was trained as a locksmith for $625. A few months before the raid on Harpers Ferry by John Brown, a colored woman purchased five slaves from Peter Manigualt for $1,200. During the early part of the nineteenth century, many of the slave purchases made by black women were of their offspring who were owned by white masters. In 1818, for example, Louise Florence purchased her daughter, Manite, from her "old massa" for $230. As the number of colored women who owned slaves steadily increased, they dominated the slaveholding within the free black community of Charleston."

Table 2.5. Age and Sex Distribution of the Slaves Held by Free Blacks in Charleston City, South Carolina, I850

Ward	Under I0	10–23	24–35	36–54	55–100	Total
	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F
1	21/20	12/19	12/21	8/12	3/11	56/83
2	I7/18	23/39	16/25	6/5	7/12	69/99
3	11/19	18/26	9/22	17/12	5/13	60/92
4	20/26	35/45	23/36	32/55	8/16	I18/178
Total	69/83	88/129	60/104	63/84	23/52	303/452
% of Slaves	9.1/10.9	11.6/17.1	7.9/13.7	8.3/11.1	3.0/6.8	40.13/59.87
Sex Ratio	83.I3	68.21	57.69	75.00	44.23	67.03

Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I & II, Charleston City, South Carolina.

During the nineteenth century, free black women were the owners of a considerable portion of the slaves held by free persons of color in the urban communities of South Carolina. In 1840, for example, half of the slaves held by free blacks of Georgetown and Richland City were owned by free black women. The colored women of Charleston City held 478 out of 755, or 63.3 percent, of the slaves belonging to free blacks in 1850. Within ten years, the portion of slaves held by free black women declined to 43.1 percent of the slaves owned by free blacks in the city of Charleston. In 1860, black women owned 166 of the 385 slaves owned by free blacks. And, in 1863, they owned 129 out of 268, or nearly half, of the slaves belonging to the free blacks of Charleston City. By and large, the black slaveholding was an urban phenomenon which was dominated by colored women.'6

Even the majority of the slaves held by the free blacks of Charleston City were females. In fact, out of 755 slaves owned by free blacks, there were 452 females in 1850.

Perhaps the most striking fact about the statistics compiled from the federal census is that 41.9 percent of the slaves held by free blacks were females between 10 and 54 years old. The substantial percentage

of female slaves held by colored persons was not unusually high because it reflected the slaveholding within the white community. For instance, 38.6 percent of the slaves belonging to white citizens of Charleston City were females between 10 and 54 years old. So the distribution of female slaves owned by free blacks almost mirrored the slaveholding of white masters.

Clearly the great preponderance of female slaves resulted from the economic structure of Charleston City. Since the port city did not develop an industrial base, the majority of the slaves worked in the households of white citizens. In fact, the Charleston City Census of 1848 reported that 71.7 percent of slaves working in the city were used as house servants and 46 percent of the laboring slaves were female domestics. Surely the large number of domestic slaves indicates that there was a great demand for such services in Charleston City."

Undoubtedly much of the slaveholding of free blacks centered upon the hiring out of domestic slaves to white persons. Since the slaveholding of free blacks was a statistical copy of white slaveowning, the large number of female slaves suggest that the colored masters hired out their slaves for profit. In September 1852, for example, Ruth C. Garden, a free mulatto of Charleston City, collected the wages of her deceased mother's slaves, which amounted to $64.00."

Outside the urban centers, the slaveholding of free blacks was not dominated by either female slaveowners or female slaves. In 1850, the rural slaveholders of African heritage were overwhelmingly male. Indeed, out of 38 colored masters, there were 31 male slaveowners in the countryside. Unlike the cities and towns, male heads of household were quite common within the community of rural free blacks. Clearly the large number of male slaveholders reflected the prevailing trend in the countryside of male heads of dwelling. By 1860 the number of rural slaveholders who were black men remained at 31 slave masters while the number of female slaveowners grew to 12. Even though the number of black men who owned slaves remained the same, they still represented the majority of the slave masters in the rural communities of South Carolina.

The large proportion of male slaveholders can be attributed to several factors. First of all, the managing of farms and plantations usually was the function of males throughout the South because most women did not have the desire or the economic resources to become planters. Within the rural communities of free blacks, the situation was quite similar to that in the white society. Many well-to-do black

men purchased farming land in South Carolina. In 1858, for example, Lamb Stevens, a free black of St. James & Goose Creek Parish, bought 800 acres of land from A. V. Dawson for $3,500. Surely the cost of commercial farming limited the number of free black women who could have purchased such estates. Even the wealthy colored women who were capable of buying plantations chose the comforts and security of urban slaveholding. Furthermore, when free black women inherited slaves and land, they often decided to sell their human chattel rather than use their slaves in commercial planting. In 1855, for example, Becky Glencamp, the wife of Isaac Glencamp, sold all of the slaves, plantation provisions, and livestock belonging to her deceased husband. By and large, free black men were the majority of the colored slaveowners in the countryside of South Carolina.19

Throughout the rural communities of South Carolina, the use of male slaves was quite prevalent among the colored slaveowners. In fact, the major difference between rural and urban black slaveholding was the balance of the sexes of the slaves held. Unlike the urban form of slavery, female slaves did not dominate the slaveholding of rural black masters. In 1850, for example, 159 out of 303, or 52.4 percent, of the slaves held by free blacks in the countryside were male slaves.

Many of the colored planters tried to maintain a balance between male and female slaves. In St. Stephen's Parish, for example, James Peagler, a free mulatto and a rice planter, owned seven males and six females in 1850. In another example, Margaret Mitchell Harris used the labor of eleven males and eleven females to work her rice plantation in Georgetown District in 1849.20

Table 2.6. Age and Sex Distribution of Slaves Held by Free Blacks in the Rural Counties of South Carolina, 1850

District	Under 10	10–23	24–35	36–54	55–100	Total
	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F
Anderson	0/0	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/0	0/1
Barnwell	5/4	3/4	2/1	4/I	0/0	14/10
Charleston	22/16	20/16	9/15	9/12	8/10	68/69
Colleton	3/5	2/I	2/3	0/2	1/0	8/11
Georgetown	10/8	12/8	2/8	6/6	2/0	32/30
Horry	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	1/1	I/1
Orangeburgh	1/1	0/0	0/1	0/1	1/1	2/4
Picken	0/0	0/0	0/0	2/0	0/1	2/1
Sumter	10/I	5/7	5/4	8/1	0/0	28/13
York	2/0	2/3	0/0	0/1	0/0	4/4
Total	53/35	44/39	20/33	29/24	13/13	159/144
% of Slaves	17.4/11.5	14.5/12.8	6.6/10.8	9.5/7.9	4.2/4.2	52.4/47.5
Sex Ratio	66.03	88.63	165.00	82.75	100.00	90.56

Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I & II, South Carolina.

For the most part, free black planters relied on the labor of males to till the soil of their farms and plantations. So the percentage of male slaves was greater than in the slaveholding of the black urbanites of Charleston City. For instance, male slaves between 10 and 54 years old consisted of 30.6 percent of the slaveholding among the black planters in the rural localities, while the same age group of males represented 27.9 percent of the slaves held by black urbanities. Also, the total population of male slaves surpassed 50 percent of the slaveholding of the rural black masters. Yet the proportion of male slaves held by black Charlestonians barely exceeded 40 percent. Undoubtedly the differences of the two economies resulted in the disparities between the slaveholding of rural and urban free blacks. Clearly the rural system of slavery was predicated upon agricultural enterprise, which demanded the labor of both male and female slaves and attempted to maintain an equilibrium between the sexes. The urban form of slavery, on the other hand, developed into a service economy, which was dominated by female slaves who primarily worked as domestic servants.

The most apparent similarity between rural and urban

slaveholding within the free black society was the dominance of mulatto slaveowners. Even though the free mulatto community consisted of 48.7 percent of the free black population, they comprised 83.1 percent of the Afro-American slaveholders from South Carolina in 1850. Clearly the over-representation of free mulattoes was a reflection of their privileged origins. Many of the mulatto slaveowners were the offspring of white planters and merchants who provided them with slaves. For instance, Thomas Hanscome, a white planter of St. James & Goose Creek, provided the mulatto children of Nancy Randall, a free black woman, with six slaves as well as stocks and bonds valued at $150,000. Quite often the children from the illicit affairs of free black women and white men were provided for by their fathers. In 1823, the mulatto children of Henry Glencamp, the superintendent of the Santee Canal, and Jenny Wilson, a free black woman, inherited 18 slaves as well as the plantation called Pine Hill in Stephens Parish of Charleston District.21 By and large, the ties of kinship between free mulattoes and whites facilitated the ascent of many mulattoes into the class of slaveowners.

Although many free mulattoes received their slaves from white benefactors, most did not depend upon the gifts of white relatives. The majority of the free mulattoes earned the money to purchase slaves by their own industry. Many mulattoes were trained as artisans and provided services for their communities. With their skills and a clientele, they soon prospered and subsequently purchased slaves. In 1849, for example, John B. Mathews, a free mulatto and a tailor, used the proceeds from his business and bought a 30-year-old black man named Jack from James C. Wilson and Jacob Weston for $350. In Charleston City, Amelia L. Cornwell, a mulatto seamstress, used her skills to purchase slaves.22 In 1858, the mulatto woman accumulated $1,200, which was used to buy a black slave family.23 Throughout the antebellum period, free mulattoes thus used their own industry to earn the capital to be invested in slave property.

For the most part, the mulatto slaveowners used their bondsmen as commodities. In 1846, for example, Robert Mishaw, a free mulatto of Charleston City, was given a 25-year-old black slave named Joe by his grandmother. Within one year, he sold the male slave to Peter Cain for $650. While some mulattoes sold their slaves for profit, others used the labor of slaves in their trades and businesses. In 1850, Frederick Campbell, a free mulatto of Charleston City, utilized the services of a 21-year-old black male in his barber shop. In another example, Daniel Peagler of St. Stephens Parish applied the labor of his slaves to work the Upton Plantation and produced corn, peas, rice, and sweet potatoes on a commercial scale. 24

As the free mulattoes began to exploit the labor of slaves, the gap between blacks and mulattoes continued to widen. Since the majority of the colored masters were mulattoes and their slaves were overwhelmingly of black skin, a division developed between the two classes which embraced both a racial and a class conflict. Within the free black community of Charleston City, many mulattoes separated themselves from the darkskinned segment of the free society. For instance, they banned darkskinned people from their social clubs and seldom married unmixed blacks. Many of the mulatto slaveowners aligned themselves with the white society and helped to preserve the system of slavery.25

The conflict between blacks and mulattoes was a class struggle which can be vividly seen in the events causing the failure of the Denmark Vesey conspiracy. As the slaves of Charleston and Georgetown were preparing to break their shackles of bondage and take their freedom, they were betrayed by a mulatto slave and a mulatto slaveowner. In 1822, Peter Desverneys, the mulatto slave of J.C. Prioleau, learned of the proposed rebellion. After seeking the advice of William Penceel, a free mulatto slaveowner of Charleston City, who urged him to tell his master of the slave plot, the slave told his owner what he had discovered. Once the white slaveowners learned of the rebellion, they arrested the rebels and prevented the revolt. When William Penceel urged Peter Desverneys to betray the slave rebels, he was protecting his slave property. In May of 1822, Penceel owned two slaves and did not intend to free them.

Many of the mulatto slaveowners were commercial masters and aligned themselves with the white community to preserve the system of slavery. These mulattoes were aware that if the rebellion succeeded they would lose their slaves and perhaps even their lives. So they sided with the white society, serving as the eyes and ears of the white slaveowners.

Although the proportion of colored slaveowners was quite small when compared to the number of white slave masters, they owned a modest percentage of the slaves in South Carolina. The black masters of the Palmetto State owned nearly one percent of the slaves in 1830. Within the city of Charleston, the proportion of slaves held by free blacks was much larger than the statewide figure. In 1830, the colored masters owned 7.7 percent of the slaves in the port city. By 1860 the proportion of slaves held by black masters declined to 2.2 percent. Yet at the height of black slaveholding, the presence of colored masters could be seen throughout the city of Charleston.

Chapter Three

From Slavery to Freedom to Slaveownership

In antebellum South Carolina, it was not unusual for freed slaves to purchase human chattel once manumitted. For many black slaveowners, freedom had to be acquired before they could obtain the capital to buy slaves.

From the early eighteenth century until the prohibition of private manumission in 1820, the pattern of interracial intimacy appears to have been the most common means of gaining liberty in South Carolina. It was quite common for female slaves and mulatto children to be freed by white masters. Furthermore, the offspring of slave women and their white owners often received not only their freedom and a small endowment but slaves.

However, for other former slaves, the road to freedom was an uphill journey. These ex-slaves earned their freedom by duties rendered in the Revolutionary War, or they worked in their spare time and eventually saved enough money to buy their freedom. Still others were granted their liberty because of faithful service given to their masters. Once the ex-slaves broke their shackels of bondage and began to prosper, they considered the acquisition of their own slaves. In fact, many former slaves actually purchased slaves after they became firmly established in the free community.

The sentiments of many freed slaves who became slave masters were very ambiguous towards slavery. In spite of spending years in bondage, the freed slaves habored no ill feelings toward their former masters and showed no signs of a deep hatred for the institution that enslaved them. The ex-slaves who owned human chattel regarded slavery not as an oppressive institution but as an economic necessity upon which their livelihood depended.

As slavery became an established institution in South Carolina, emancipation was generally received upon the deathbed of slave masters. For many slaves, freedom was obtained through the last will and testament of their masters. The slaves thus receiving their freedom were primarily females and mulatto children. In 1720, for example, a mulatto woman named Ruth and her three children were manumitted by James Gilbertson. In another example, Billy, the

mulatto child of a black slave woman, was emancipated by the will of a Berkeley County widow in 1737. Eight years later, a mulatto child named Rachel received not only her freedom but also an endowment of 100 pounds upon the death of her mistress.' John Duncan wrote in 1972 that "the miscegenous nature of South Carolina society is nowhere better revealed than by the fact that one-third of all the recorded colonial manumissions were mulatto children and three-fourth of all adult manumissions were females."2

After the colonial era, female slaves and mulatto children continued to be manumitted by their owners. In 1798, Nancy and her daughter Mary were emancipated by the will of a Chyhaw planter. Elsewhere in the state, Peggy, an African slave, and her mulatto child were declared free upon the death of James Irving in 1800.'

In many instances, the female slaves and their mulatto offspring were manumitted because of their kinship ties to their owners. Hetty Marshal and her mulatto children were acknowledged as the offspring of William Doughty when he freed his colored family in 1812. While several masters recognized their mulatto offspring as their legitimate heirs, other owners refused to publicly admit that the slave women and mulatto children being freed in their wills were more than mere chattel. Yet the provisions made by the slave masters for their female slaves and mulatto children suggest, more than a humanitarian urge, the responsibility of guilt-stricken masters. In 1779, Betty, the slave of Deodotus Bradshaw, received her freedom as well as the entire estate of her master. Usually, in cases where female slaves were given large endowments from their owners, interracial intimacy had occurred. Furthermore, the emancipation and bestowal of property to the mulatto children by their owners suggest kinship ties between the slaves and their masters. Carolina Harrison, a spinster of St. Bartholomew's Parish, freed her mulatto slave, James Harrison, in her will. In addition to his freedom, the mulatto child was given the proceeds from the sale of his owner's slaves and a plantation on the high hills of the Santee as well as three slaves.' By and large, the colonial trend of freeing female slaves and mulatto children continued to be a major source of manumissions in the early part of the nineteenth century.

In spite of the persistence of interracial intimacy, such relationships did not always guarantee the freedom of the slave women or their children. In 1792, the mulatto mistress of Isaac Broughton Dwight was not freed. Yet Dwight directed his executors to sell his estate and purchase the freedom of his daughters and the unborn child of his colored mistress. Then he requested that his

children were to be educated and maintained during their lives from the interest of his estate. Undoubtedly, many slave mistresses and their children were not manumitted and continued to serve as slaves.5

However, other slaves did not have to depend upon the prayers that their masters would issue deathbed manumissions. In many instances, the female slaves and their children received their freedom by deeds of manumission rather than upon the death of their owners. In Charleston City, Diana and her four children were freed from slavery when her master issued a deed of manumission in November 1793. Seven years later, Lucretia Clarke of Charleston City also recorded a deed of manumission. She emancipated her black servant, Rose, and the slave woman's children, Elizabeth and Mary, on August 6, 1800. In that same year, the mulatto daughter of a black woman named Charlotte was freed by John Gardiner Thorne, a sail maker of Charleston City.6 During the postrevolutionary era, many of the slaves freed by deeds of manumission were female slaves and their mulatto children.

The pattern of emancipating slave mistresses and their children was quite apparent in the deeds of emancipation. On March 26, 1811, for example, Rebecca Thorne and her son were emancipated by a deed of manumission from their owner, John S. Thorne. Once emancipated, Rebecca and her son continued to live in the household of their former master. However, her relationship with Thorne was not a servant-master interaction but that of a husband and wife. In fact, while Rebecca Thorne was a free woman, she gave birth to six mulatto children by John S. Thorne. Furthermore, she inherited the estate of her common-law husband. After his death, she received a house on Boundary Street in Charleston Neck and four slaves. Like Rebecca Thorne, many black women received their freedom because of intimate relations with their white masters.'

Yet not all of the freed slaves owed their liberty to such intimate relations. In many instances, slaves earned their freedom by meritorious deeds in South Carolina. During the Revolutionary War, the heroic deeds of slaves occasionally prompted the state assembly or their masters to emancipate them. Even though slaves were prohibited from bearing arms and fighting for colonial South Carolina, they provided other services. Usually the slaves performed whatever non-combat services were required of them. However, the lines between non-military and military duties were often crossed. For instance, the slave named Antigua was requested to go behind the British lines and procure information concerning the movement and designs of enemy troops. Antigua often performed his assignments at great risk to his

life. For his services to the state, he was granted the only reasonable reward for his deeds. In 1783, the state assembly manumitted Antigua as well as his wife and their children.'

While some slaves occasionally performed quasi-military duties, others were assigned as servants to colonial officers. Mose Irvine, for example, was required by his master to attend the needs of General Francis Marion. While conducting his duties, he was captured by the British and taken into the upper part of the state. But he somehow escaped from the British and returned to his master. As a result of his loyalty, he was manumitted by his master.9

The emancipations mentioned above were the exceptions rather than the usual reasons for manumitting slaves in the state. Yet there were many ex-slaves who owed their freedom to the rising revolutionary spirit of liberty and justice, which touched the hearts of their former masters and influenced their manumissions. In 1797, Joseph Wigfall, planter of Charleston District, provided for the freedom of nine slaves. 10 Also, Sarah Chapman of St. Andrews Parish requested that her slaves should be manumitted as well as given several acres of land in 1799.11 The revolutionary rhetoric of freedom prodded the conscience of slave masters, and some the guilt-stricken owners freed their slaves.

During the postrevolutionary period, it was not unusual for slaves to buy their freedom. Generally the slaves received the permission of their masters to work outside of their environment to facilitate the purchase. The hired-out slaves were primarily artisans who were permitted to keep a small percentage of the fees given to their masters for services rendered by them. Other slaves simply worked in their spare time and accumulated enough capital to purchase their liberty. In 1782, Stephney, the slave of Robert Biddolph of Charleston District, purchased his freedom from Biddolph for 80 guineas. After the exchange of money, the slave was manumitted by his master.

The price of liberty for several slaves amounted to a considerable sum of money. For example, the slave named Summer bought his freedom from Thomas Jackson of St. Thomas Parish for 100 pounds sterling in 1784. In that same year, Charles, the servant of John Bee Holmes, was liberated from servitude for the sum of 200 guineas. Yet for others, the price of freedom was a nominal sum. Emie, the house servant of Peter Buyck, was manumitted from slavery when she gave her master just ten pounds sterling in 1790.12 In Charleston District, the number of contracts between slaves and masters for the freedom

of the bondsmen was quite significant, but the transaction was by no means typical.

Throughout the state, the virtue and dedication of faithful servants were occasionally rewarded by freeing the trusted slaves. In Charleston District, Bess nursed a white infant named Benjamin Guerand as if the child were her own. Once Guerand reached maturity, he recalled Bess' faithfulness when he was a child. He declared his gratitude for the services and rewarded the slave woman with her freedom in 1784.13 In St. Bartholomew's Parish, Pender, the servant of Alexander Wilson, was manumitted by her master for faithful services that she provided her owner and given 100 pounds sterling in 1796. Elsewhere in the state, Hagar was emancipated upon the death of her mistress, Mary Holman, for faithful and meritorious services in 1798." By and large, the faithfulness of many slaves resulted from their desire to prompt their masters to manumit them for their diligent services.

During the postrevolutionary era, the free black population began to grow by substantial numbers as manumission became more widespread in the state. In 1790, the number of free blacks stood at 1,801 in South Carolina. By 1800 there were 3,185 free persons of color living in the state. Between 1790 and 1800, the free black community increased by 76.8 percent. But after 1800 the free black community grew at moderate levels. The community grew from 3,185 in 1800 to 4,554 in 1810, which was an increase of 1,369 colored persons, or a rate of increase of 42.9 percent. After 1820, the rate of increase was at a much smaller level than in the period between 1800 and 1810. For example, between 1820 and 1830, the population only grew by 16.2 percent; between 1830 and 1840, by 12 percent. The major reason for the small rate of increase was the fact that manumission became a legislative function in 1820. As the prerogative of the state assembly, the number of emancipations never surpassed the number of manumissions issued by the slave masters. Therefore, the rate of increase declined after emancipation was no longer the prerogative of the slaveholders."

As early as 1800, the state legislature attempted to control manumission. In that same year, private manumission was regulated, if not restricted, by the state assembly. Before 1800, personal manumissions were similar to the traditions of the pre-revolutionary era and issued by individual masters. In essence, a contract was established between the slave master and the slave. Since no official sanction was required by the law, a certificate of freedom was not always given to the freed slave. But according to the Act of 1800,

manumission was legal only when a court of magistrates and freeholders completed an investigation of the capacity of the slave to function as a free person and then endorsed the deed of manumission. In 1805, a slave woman named Rose of Marion County was emancipated by her master after a court of magistrates and freeholders investigated the capacity of the slave woman to support herself. After the emancipation inquiry, her certificate of freedom stated:

> Before me Robert Hodges ... we hereby certify upon the Emancipation on Oath of James Martin the Owner of a certain Slave named Rose a black woman about 19 or 20 years old and satisfactory proof has been given to us that the said Slave is of a good character and is able and capable of gaining a livelihood."

The statute of 1800 was used primarily to regulate the number of slaves freed who could not support themselves because of illness or old age. Undoubtedly, during the period before the legislation was passed, several masters freed their old, infirm slaves who could no longer be used as laborers, thereby ridding themselves of an added expense. Yet the slaves who were without any economic resources to maintain themselves found it difficult to function as free persons. So they became an economic burden to the state and prompted the legislators to regulate the emancipations of slaves."

However, the statute of 1800 not only regulated manumission but restricted the growth of the free black community. According to the law, manumission would be granted to slaves who could be self-supportive. The law, therefore, made it difficult to manumit slave children because they were too young to be capable of supporting themselves. Before the measure was passed, the free black population increased by 76.8 percent between 1790 and 1800. Once the law was implemented, the rate of increase never surpassed that level.

In 1820 the state legislature passed a statute which banned personal manumission in South Carolina. According to the Act of 1820, slaveowners could not legally manumit their slaves without the consent of both houses of the state assembly. In order to obtain the permission of the legislature, the slave masters petitioned the state assembly to issue a proclamation of emancipation which would free their faithful servants. Yet obtaining the permission of the legislature was a difficult task because most of the assemblymen believed that there were far too many freed slaves and descendants of freed slaves in the state. As a consequence, few slaves were manumitted by the

state legislature.

In spite of the restrictions on personal manumission, many faithful servants were illegally emancipated by their owners. In 1826, Toney Weston, alias Anthony Weston, was freed by his master for faithful services. The will of Plowden Weston, a wealthy planter of Charleston District, requested that his executors should emancipate his mulatto servant." In the will, he wrote:

> In consideration of the good conduct and faithful valuable service of my mulatto man Toney by trade a millwright I have for some years past given him to himself of his time say from the middle of May to the middle of November every year. I do direct that the same indulegence be given to him for six years from the time of my death during which time he may instruct other servants in his Profession ... and at the expiration of six years from the time of my death I will and direct that his whole time be given up to him ... after the expiration of six years he may be emancipated and set free or allowed to depart from the State ... 19

Unfortunately for Anthony Weston, when his emancipation was declared, the state legislature had banned private manumission. Consequently, his emancipation was illegal unless the declaration was approved by the state assembly. But there was no indication that the legislature consented to the quasi-emancipation. The manumissions granted by the state were restricted to slaves who performed herculean tasks, thereby reducing the number of legal emancipations to a handful. Even though Anthony Weston could not be legally freed by his master, the executors of his owner allowed him to blend into the free black community. Far example, the federal census marshals of the 1840 and 1860 censuses reported that Weston was a free colored person. Furthermore, he paid free Negro capitation taxes in 1827, 1832, 1836, 1840, and 1846. The capitation taxes were required of all free black men between 16 and 60 years old as well as free black women between 14 and 55 years old.20 By and large, Anthony Weston conducted himself as if he were a free person of color in spite of the fact that he received no official document from the state to prove his freedom.

In the same will of Plowden Weston, another faithful servant named Lydia, alias Lydia Weston, was freed. In the will, he recalled that

> My Servant Lydia a colored woman with the greatest care and

> tenderness waited upon me day and night during my severe illness about two years ago and has ever since with unwearied diligence devoted herself to my comfort attending to all my wants and infirmities in consideration thereof her faithful services I direct that she be permitted to act for herself in such way as she may think will promote her own well being ... and I give and bequeath to the said woman Lydia an annuity of sixty dollars yearly ...31

Fortunately for Lydia Weston, the executors of her master allowed her to act as a free person of color. Like Anthony Weston, she was reported on the federal censuses as a free black. She, too, paid free Negro capitation taxes in 1846.22 In short, Anthony and Lydia Weston, like other black servants, obtained their freedom illegally because of their faithful services rendered to their masters.

Once freed, the former slaves were usually prepared to embark upon their new lives as free persons. As a result of the statute of 1800, slaves were required to be able to function economically in the society before emancipation would be granted. In other words, the freed slaves must have a means of supporting themselves. Consequently, the slaves who received their freedom were primarily semi-skilled and skilled workers. In fact, the training that the former slaves received began at an early age while they were in bondage. For instance, a slave named Hagar was apprenticed to a seamstress when she was between six and ten years old. When Hagar became sixteen years old, her apprenticeship concluded with her emancipation. Other slaves were sent by their masters to be instructed in the handicrafts by skilled artisans. In Fairfield County, a slave named April Ellison was sent by his master to Captain McCreighton to be apprenticed. Under the watchful eyes of his teacher, the slave soon learned the trade of repairing and making cotton gins. Once April had been sufficiently trained, he was manumitted by his master. After the freed slaves finished their training, emancipation was just a formality because of the preparation received as slaves.23

Former slaves began to enter into numerous trades. It was not unusual for them to work as barbers, carpenters, cotton gin makers, pastry cooks, shoemakers, and tailors. After George Mathews, a freed slave, was released from bondage by his owner, Mrs. Martha Ann Mathews, he applied his training as a carpenter to serve the citizens of Charleston City.24 Like Mathews, many of the freed slaves directed their skills toward the consumers of the urban cities and towns. As a consequence, the freed slave artisans primarily served white clients

who were generally situated along the coast of South Carolina.

In the agrarian society of the Palmetto State, there was a constant demand for skilled artisans on plantations as well as in the towns and the cities. The scarcity of artisans meant that the services of freed slaves were in great demand. The need for artisans allowed former slaves to provide their services to planters. Anthony Weston, mentioned above, worked for Col. Benjamin Franklin Hunt as an artisan. Weston used his training as a millwright to improve a thrashing machine on the rice plantation of Col. Hunt. When Anthony Weston finished the improvements, the thrashing machine produced 1,000 bushels of rice per day.

In Charleston City, there also existed a demand for skilled laborers. In fact, ex-slaves who were artisans instructed the servants of slaveowners in the skills of their trades in order to meet the demand for trained workers. For instance, Sally Seymour, a former slave and a pastry cook, taught a slave woman named Lydia in the art of cooking." Elsewhere in the state, freed artisans worked in the smaller markets in Beaufort, Georgetown, and Richland Counties.

Several former slaves acquired small shops to house their growing businesses. In 1822, Mose Irvine owned a small shoe store on 11 Logan Street in Charleston City. A short distance from his business was a pastry store operated by a freed slave. On 80 Tradd Street, Sally Seymour owned and managed a pastry establishment. Elsewhere in the state, an ex-slave acquired a cotton gin shop. William Ellison of Stateburg, Sumter County, operated a successful business repairing and making cotton gins in the 1820s, and he continued the trade until his death in 1861.26

Although several ex-slaves were able to purchase their own stores, others were not so lucky. These former slaves simply rented vacant buildings to practice their trades. Still other freed slaves used their own homes to conduct their businesses. As the demand for their services increased, they sought permanent lodging for their expanding businesses. The increased volume of business forced the colored entrepreneurs to seek not only new lodging, but laborers as well.

Many ex-slaves making their way up in the world of business considered the acquisition of slaves to fulfill their demands for workers. As the volume of their businesses increased, many ex-slaves could not meet the growing demands for their services solely by themselves. Due to the increased demands for the skills of colored entrepreneurs, they were compelled to acquire laborers. In the

antebellum South, there existed two sources of labor to be exploited by the colored artisans. The first supply was free labor. But the availability of free labor was primarily restricted to free blacks because most southern white workers found it difficult to work for black persons. The black entrepreneurs, therefore, sought the services of free black workers, but the supply of colored laborers was also limited. As a result of the demand for skilled and unskilled workers, there was a constant need for free black artisans as well as laborers. Furthermore, the desire among the free black laborers to work for themselves contributed to the shortage of workers. So the supply of free black laborers could not be always utilized by the freed slaves. In short, the ex-slaves often sought the services of the most available supply of labor present, which was slave power.

In Charleston City, it was quite common for freed slaves to use the labor of slaves in their businesses. In 1795, for instance, Sally Martin, otherwise known as Sally Seymour, was manumitted by Thomas Martin. Once freed, she worked as a pastry cook to support herself and her mulatto children. As the demand for her trade increased, she could not provide her services by herself. Clearly, Sally Seymour was compelled by the need for laborers and so she acquired slave workers. Just seven years after Seymour was freed, she purchased a black female named Chloe from James Bulgin for $400. The aid of the slave woman was sufficient to meet much of the demands required by her business. However, years later she began searching the market place for another laborer. On August 6, 1814, she bought a black male named Felix, who was about 21 years old, from James Mackie for $800. Under the instruction of Sally Seymour, the slave was trained in the art of cooking. For nearly ten years, Felix worked as a cook in his owner's pastry shop."

Needless to say, Sally Seymour saw the utility of slave labor. Her need for workers undoubtedly stimulated her to buy and use the labor of slaves for her own benefit. Consequently, she used slave labor with little remorse or guilt. In fact, her ownership of human chattel spanned more than 22 years, and during that period of time, she used the labor of at least four slaves. When Sally Seymour died in 1824, she left behind an estate that was valued at $1,645.75 and consisted of two slaves, her cook Felix, and a servant woman named Jenny, who was assessed at $100. So acceptable were the benefits of slavery to Sally Seymour that she even provided her daughter with two slaves shortly before her death. On March 12, 1823, she sold two slaves named Flora and George to her daughter, Eliza Seymour Lee, for the nominal sum of five dollars.2e

Philida Turner, an emancipated slave of Charleston Neck, was another former slave who was aware of the utility of slavery. Six years after Turner was manumitted, she bought a female slave named Celia and the mulatto child of the slave woman from Samuel Barnett, a planter of St. James Santee, for $500 in 1810. Clearly her occupation as a seamstress influenced the acquisition of slaves. Philida Turner continued to use the services of Celia until 1825, when she sold her servant woman to Augustus F. Gaillard for $300.29

In Charleston City, Bersheba Cattle, the former slave of J.H. Stevens, invested in slaves. In 1818 Cattle purchased a servant woman named Nanny, who was about 38 years old, from Mrs. Motta for $550.30 Rather than employing the slave in her business, she hired the woman out to prospective users. In the will of Bersheba Cattle, she requested that "my said Executors shall receive the wages of the said wench Nanny ..."31 Prior to Bersheba Cattle's purchase of Nanny, she bought a slave named Rose from Susan Fenwick, a colored woman, for $400. In 1813, she probably utilized the services of Rose, who was a seamstress, by hiring out the slave woman. After less than one year of using the labor of Rose, she became displeased by the conduct of her servant and sold the slave to Dr. Robert Magwood for $400.32

In short, the economic benefits of slavery stimulated ex-slaves to buy slaves to be utilized as laborers in their businesses or hired out to nonslaveowners for fees. In a society where slavery was an accepted form of labor, it was not surprising that former slaves exploited the vast reservoir of slave labor.

The ex-slaves who acquired slaves for their own benefit often assimilated into the culture of white slaveowners. They viewed slavery as a viable and legitimate institution which was to be exploited for profit. For example, Hannibal, the former slave of Thomas Dearington and a slave driver, requested that his executors invest the proceeds from his estate into the purchase of "as many young Negro Woman (as the different sums con- solodated will buy) and ... to be put on shares or hired out ..."33 Also like the white slave masters, the ex-slaves who rose from bondage to slaveownership used their human chattel as collateral to secure loans. In 1794, Sabinah, a free black woman of Charleston City, used her slaves named Myretetta, Charlotte, and Cornelia as security to procure a loan from James Hamilton Thomas for 239 pounds sterling and 12 shillings." In South Carolina, a high degree of acculturation can be observed in virtually every facet of the lives of the ex-slaves who acquired human chattel for profit.

For many former slaves, the process of acculturation can be

partially explained by their experience as slaves. E. Horace Fitchett noted in 1940 that "in a very real sense ... these persons were not slaves. They were in some instances recognized as the offspring of the upper caste member; they were allowed freedom of action and movement; and they were accorded special privileges. Thus they were not treated as slaves nor did they conceive of themselves as slaves."" Fitchett's observations are quite correct. The mulatto offspring of slave women and white slaveowners, in many instances, were treated not as slaves but legitimate heirs. According to their wills, white slaveowners often manumitted their slave children as well as providing for them economically. For example, the slave offspring of George Galphin, a white merchant of the Silver Bluff, were not only freed from the legal restrictions of slavery but educated while in servitude. Although the slave children of Galphin were technically his property because they were born to slave women owned by him, he did not treat them as his chattel. According to the accounts of Bernard Elliotts, a recruiter during the Revolutionary War, the slave children of Galphin were educated. Also, Elliotts never mentioned that the offspring of the slave master were slaves.

In fact, the relationship between Galphin and his offspring went far beyond the exchange between master and slave to an interaction between father and child. So it was that in his will, he requested that his children should be emancipated and given a portion of his estate. He requested that his mulatto daughter, Rachel, should be granted her freedom as well as four African slaves from the first ship that arrived in the state.36

In many instances, mulatto children were offspring of white slaveowners and slave women who lived together as husband and wife. For example, John Walker, a white slaveowner of Charleston City, fathered eight mulatto children by his slave woman named Ann Jones Walker. Although the couple was not legally married, the relationship was primarily that of husband and wife. Yet the mulatto children of John Walker were unable to exercise their freedom legally. Even though their father petitioned the state assembly to emancipate them, the request was denied in 1825. Nevertheless, the mulatto children of Walker acted as though they had been legally freed and even owned slaves for their benefit. According to the will of John Walker, his colored family was given the wages of the slaves owned by him. After his death, Ann Jones Walker and her children received the wages of John, Stephen, Catherine, Flora, Mary, Lewis, and Peter, which amounted to $76.50 for the month of March 1840. As well as receiving the wages of the slaves held in trust for the colored family by Edward North, they eventually acquired the ownership of the

slaves bequeathed to them. But none of the family members chose to emancipate their slaves, and so they continued to exploit the labor of slaves for their own benefit like their father.37

The mulatto children of slave masters, who were accepted as legitimate heirs held a position in the household of their fathers which placed them in a superior status over the other slaves. These children were accustomed to the master-slave relationship; however, they conceived of themselves not as slaves but slave masters. In spite of the fact that they were of African descent, the white blood that ran through their veins separated them from their fellow black slaves on the estates of their fathers. For example, the children of Michael Fowler, a white planter of Christ Church Parish, and his black companion named Sibb were raised in an environment which condoned slavery. According to Calvin D. Wilson, in 1912, "there was a rich planter in Charleston named Fowler who took a woman of African descent and established her in his home.... There was a daughter born, who was called Isabella; the planter insisted that she should be known as Miss Fowler. 1138 Clearly Michael Fowler expected his slaves to serve and regard his mulatto children as though they were white. So the offspring of Fowler were treated as little masters and mistresses by the slaves of their father.

In fact, the process of cultural assimilation was so complete that the children of Michael Fowler, once reaching maturity and inheriting their father's plantation and slaves, chose to align themselves with the values of white slaveowners rather than embracing the spirit of freedom and liberty espoused by the abolitionists. 39 In 1810, the estate of the deceased Michael Fowler was divided among his mulatto children, John Fowler, Jacob Fowler, Stanhope Fowler, Nelly Fowler Collins, Becky Fowler, and Isabella Fowler Dereef. When the descendants of Michael Fowler received their slaves, manumission was still the privilege of the slaveowners; however, none of the heirs chose to emancipate their slaves. In March 1817, Jacob Fowler sold a slave named Flora, who was inherited from the estate of Michael Fowler, to his brother Stanhope Fowler for $560. Also, Stanhope Fowler, Nelly Fowler Collins, and Isabella Fowler Dereef continued to own slaves until the surrender of South Carolina during the Civil War.4° Undoubtedly, the children of Michael Fowler considered slavery a viable labor system and chose to hold their slaves in bondage.

Mulatto children were not always acknowledged as the offspring of white slaveholders. However, upon the death of their owners, they occasionally were manumitted and provided for once freed. These children probably were unaware of the bond of kinship to their

owners. Yet that bond allowed them to receive preferential treatment from their slave masters. The unknowing mulatto offspring of white slaveowners often were trained as house servants or artisans. Although they were not acknowledged as the children of slave masters, their encounter with the culture of their masters influenced them to become slaveowners.

In fact, the slaves of both mixed and unmixed racial heritage who served as house servants or artisans accepted certain aspects of the culture of white slaveowners. Regrettably, the close interaction with the Southern culture influenced many slaves to identify with their owners. For the house slaves, the contact with their masters and mistresses perpetuated the difference between themselves and the majority of the slaves who tilled the soil. The house servants were taught to consider themselves superior to the common field hands. Furthermore, the house slaves' conception of superiority was reinforced by their dress, food, and housing, which was slightly better than that given to the field hands. So it was that they separated themselves from the field slaves and occasionally accepted the values of their slaveowners and looked upon slavery as a justified institution. As a consequence, they envied the life of splendor that their owners enjoyed and viewed slavery as a means of obtaining the luxuries possessed by their masters. For example, Mary Smith, the servant of Frederick Kohn, was manumitted by her master in 1807. Several years after Mrs. Smith was freed, she acquired a slave woman named Polly to work as her personal servant."

Perhaps the most extreme form of cultural assimilation occurred in the case of Peter Desverneys. In 1822, as the house servant of Col. J.C. Prioleau, he was the principal informer in the Denmark Vesey Slave Conspiracy. On May 25, 1822, he encountered the slave named William Paul, who told him that the slaves of the Charleston vicinity were preparing to shake off their shackles and revolt. Upon hearing the declaration of the slave, he later recalled, "I was so astonished and horror struck at this information, that it was a moment or two before I could collect myself sufficient to tell him I would have nothing to do with this business ..."42 Peter Desverneys went on to tell the slave rebel that "I was satisfied with my condition, that I was grateful to my master for his kindness and wished no change."43 Shortly after his encounter with William Paul, he told William Pencil, a free mulatto, who urged him to tell his master of the slave plot. Desverneys took that advice and informed his master of the slave conspiracy on May 30, 1822. As a result of the information provided by him, the slave plot was crushed before it could be started. For his loyalty, he was

freed by the state assembly in 1822.44

Clearly, Peter Desverneys accepted his position as a slave, but most importantly, he adhered to the doctrine of slavery. By 1840 he was the owner of two slaves named Alfred Sanders and Lavinia Cole Sanders. He used his male slave to assist him in his occupation as a drayman. Lavinia Cole Sanders was hired out by Desverneys. Indeed, Peter Desverneys' use and conception of slavery was no different from that of the white slaveowner. To Desverneys, slaves were property to be purchased, sold, and exploited. In 1847, for example, he sold George, a nine-year-old boy, to E. Poincignon for $325." He also requested that "my servant Lavinia with her issue and increase unto my wife Sarah Ann Desverneys ... immediately after the death of my said Wife I order and direct my Executor to sell the said Slave with her issue and increase at public auction ...^46 After the death of Peter Desverneys, his widow continued to use the labor of the servant woman as well as the wages of the slave, which amounted to $40 in 1862." By and large, many servants of slave masters seemed to have accepted their role as slaves and even believed that slavery was a permissible institution. So when these slaves were freed, they occasionally purchased and used the labor of slaves for their own benefit. Once they acquired slaves as investments, there were few differences between them and white slaveowners beyond the color of their skin.

The majority of the slaves seldom accepted their enslavement as legitimate. Since the overwhelming majority of slaves worked in the fields, they were less accessible to the culture of the slaveowners. Furthermore, the field hands saw slavery in a very different light than the house servants. For example, the field slaves were forced to till the soil from sunup until sundown, working themselves to a state of exhaustion. Also life in the fields could be quite hellish because the slaves were under close supervision from their overseers or slave drivers and thus subject to beatings." And the slaves who worked on rice plantations were subjected to the hazards associated with the diseases of the swamp. Many slaves lost their lives during the fever season. In short, the field slaves saw slavery as an oppressive system and when manumitted they seldom bought slaves for their own benefit.

The artisan slaves, like the house slaves, were in close contact with whites, and they occasionally absorbed the Southern culture of the slaveowners. The somewhat independent nature of the artisan slaves, particularly in the city of Charleston, allowed them a greater degree of movement than the house servants or the field hands. In

fact, many artisans lived outside of the household of their masters and were hired out to potential clients. As they served their employers, they observed that the urban institution of slavery was a slightly better system than the rural form of bondage. For several artisan slaves, their experience in bondage was a step towards freedom. For example, they could keep a small portion of their earnings and eventually buy their freedom. Once the artisan slaves procured their freedom, they occasionally purchased slaves, thus aligning themselves with their former masters by accepting certain aspects of the slaveowning culture.

In Charleston City, the black artisans who were freed from bondage occasionally viewed slavery as a means of obtaining financial security. Because of their experience as slaves, they were aware of the benefits of the peculiar institution and used their skills to purchase slaves. For instance, Anthony Weston, a de facto free black of Charleston City, was trained as a millwright. As the slave of Plowden Weston, he was hired out to several white employers as well as working for his master. In 1826, his master declared him to be a free man. Once he was freed, his skills as a millwright enabled him to prosper, thereby providing the necessary capital to invest in numerous slaves. Since he was technically a slave, he could not own slaves in his name. So all of his slaves were purchased by his wife, Maria Weston, and held for his use. On Feb. 22, 1839, she bought a slave named Harry, who was trained as a millwright, from Joseph Williams for $1,000.49 Between 1834 and 1845, she purchased a total of 20 slaves, investing $8,950. Several of the slaves purchased by Mrs. Weston were artisans who worked in her husband's millwright business. By using the labor of slaves, Anthony Weston became one of the wealthiest colored persons in the city. In 1860, for example, his estate was valued at $48,075 by the city officials.50 To Anthony Weston, slavery represented the Southern dream of wealth and success, and so he invested in that form of property.

Yet Anthony Weston's benign experience as a slave probably influenced him to treat his workers with some compassion. For example, he did not direct his wife to sell any of their slaves. Furthermore, it is likely that he knew several of the slaves purchased by his wife. For that reason, he was aware of their character and allowed them the same liberties which he had had as the slave of Plowden Weston. So he may have permitted his workers to live apart from him as well as giving them a portion of their earnings. Consequently, the slave workers may have been contented with their situation because they were aware that their employer knew what

slavery could do to the soul of the slaves. Weston may indeed have attempted to ease the pain of slavery even while he used the labor of his slaves.

Although this chapter has focused on the former slaves who purchased bondsmen to work in their businesses, it should not be concluded that all of the freed slaves purchased black men and women for their labor. In many instances, the former slaves bought family members who were bondsmen to white masters. After the freed slaves purchased their kinsfolk, they manumitted their loved ones; however, when the state assembly banned private emancipations in 1820, the colored slaveholders had to find another means to ensure the safety of their relatives. The dilemma confronted by free blacks who purchased kinsfolk will be examined more closely in chapters four and five.

Chapter Four

“Buying My Chidrum from Ole Massa”

The purchasing of slave relatives and friends was a persisent current in free black slaveholding in South Carolina. From the middle part of the eighteenth century until the Civil War, free blacks often sacrificed and struggled to free their families and friends from the chains of slavery. For many, the task of liberating a loved one from bondage involved years of hard work and saving just to buy a single slave child. Once purchased, the nominal slaves were usually manumitted by their black holders. But after 1820, free blacks could not emancipate their loved ones without the approval of both houses of the state assembly. So free blacks not only struggled to purchase their slave relations and friends but strove to provide freedom for those purchased.

Among the slave families, the bond of kinship was a strong and vibrant force in the antebellum South. Once freed, the members of a slave family often attempted to obtain that nectar of sweetness called freedom for their kinsfolk who were still slaves. In many instances, the freed slaves labored from four to twenty years to unite their families. In the Office of the Secretary of State in South Carolina, numerous accounts of black men and women who purchased their fruits of love were recorded. For example, John Mitchell, a free colored man of Georgetown District, bought his daughter, Nanny, from Sarah Wright, the wife of Governor James Wright of Georgia, for 400 pounds sterling. After Mitchell purchased his daughter, he manumitted the child in 1763.1

As the number of emancipations increased during the period from 1780 to 1820, more ex-slaves were allowed to purchase the freedom of their offspring. For instance, Betty, a free black woman of Charleston City, was manumitted by her master; however, her children remained the property of her former master, subject to being sold and separated from their mother at any time. So compelling was the situation which confronted her that she undoubtedly sacrificed much to unite her family. Fortunately, Betty was able to raise the money necessary to buy her babies. So on November 9, 1818, she bought her three sons, Josiah, Thomas, and Richard, from Thomas Young Smith for $400.2

In many instances, freed slaves like Betty acquired their freedom only to see other members of their families still slaves. When marriages occurred between slaves held by different masters, it was not unusual for one spouse to receive his or her freedom while the other spouse remained in bondage. Even when slave families lived together as a complete unit, it was quite likely that one adult member of the family would be freed while the other remained a slave.

In the early 1800s, many of the slaves manumitted had spouses who were in bondage. So the difficult task of purchasing slave children became the responsibility of the free parents. However, the spouses remaining in slavery occasionally provided what limited money they earned from extra work to help purchase their offspring. But for many black parents, as long as their spouses remained slaves, the bulk of the money needed to purchase the freedom of their offspring came from the free parents. For example, Maurice Brown, a free colored of Charleston City, worked as a shoemaker to purchase his family. Since his wife, Bella Brown, was a slave, she could not provide much assistance in the buying of their children. So most of the labor and money needed to acquire their children came from Maurice Brown. After several years of hard work and much determination, he finally acquired the money to purchase his loved ones. On August 16, 1810, he bought his wife and their children, Malcolm, Charlotte, Mary, Samuel, and Sarah Brown, from Hannah Lesense for 650 pounds sterling.3

Clearly the parental concerns of free black parents compelled them to labor for many years to free their offspring from the burdens of slavery. This commitment can be seen in the example of Titus Gregorie. Between 1800 and 1815, he worked as a carpenter with the supreme goal of freeing his children and wife from slavery. On December 23, 1803, one part of his goal became a reality when he purchased his son Aberdeen, who was three years old, from Martha Gadsden of Charleston City for $90.4 Four years later, Titus Gregorie saved enough money to buy another child from Martha Gadsden. In September 1807, he purchased his three-year-old daughter, Elizabeth, for $100. For the next eight years, he worked to free his remaining two children and his wife from servitude to Martha Gadsden. On May 18, 1815, he made his last recorded slave purchase and acquired his remaining children, Titus and Eleanor, as well as his wife, Nelly, for $450. After fifteen years of strenuous work and much determination, he had bought his loved ones for a combined sum of $640. Once he acquired his family, the next step was to remove the stigma of chattel from his loved ones. Some years later, he saw to it that his family was

freed from the legal bond of slavery.'

Peter Elwig, a free black man of Charleston City, also dedicated much of his life to freeing his family from slavery. For more than ten years, he labored as a carpenter with the sole prayer that one day he would be able to buy the freedom of his beloved wife and children. A small part of his prayer was answered when he bought his wife, Amelia, from James Richardson of Charleston City for $400. When Elwig purchased his wife, he had at least three children still in servitude to the Richardson family. However, the acquisition of Amelia Elwig ensured that any subsequent children born by her would not be the slaves of James Richardson. Furthermore, because he manumitted his wife on August 14, 1819, any children born after the emancipation were declared free from slavery. Yet, while the couple enjoyed the privileges of their freedom, they could not rest until their children born prior to the purchase and emancipation of Amelia Elwig were liberated from servitude.6 For six years, the couple sacrificed much and saved what money they earned to buy their offspring. Their prayers were finally answered in October 1823. In that month, Peter and Amelia Elwig purchased their three sons, Peter, James, and Joseph, from Ann Richardson, the wife of the deceased James Richardson, for $550.

But the struggle of the couple to free their loved ones did not end in 1823.' On the contrary, Peter and Amelia Elwig had other kinsfolk in slavery who had to be purchased. So the couple worked five more years to acquire two relatives. In May 1828, they purchased a woman named Hestor and her child, Elizabeth, from James Richardson, Jr., for $300. Although the bill of sale did not acknowledge the ties of kinship to Peter or Amelia Elwig, it is quite likely that the slaves were related to them because the slaves were purchased from the same family that held Amelia Elwig and her children as property. Hestor, therefore, was probably the sister of Amelia Elwig. By 1828 Peter Elwig had purchased six slaves over a period of eleven years at the total cost of $1,250.'

The perseverance exhibited by Titus Gregorie and Peter Elwig was not unusual. Many free blacks dedicated much of their lives and money to secure the freedom of their beloved families.

A few black parents were fortunate enough to purchase their children for a nominal sum of money. Usually a sympathetic master sold their children to them for a price well below the current market value. For instance, David Yonge, a free colored of St. Paul's Parish, bought his son, Frank, for the nominal sum of one dollar. Then, in

1815, he purchased his wife, Judy, for only one dollar. Had David Yonge bought his family at the current market value, he would have paid at least $562.50.9 According to data collected by Ulrich Phillips, the average selling price of a prime slave was $450 in 1814. A male child was about one-half the value of a prime slave and so his market value was $225. The value of a female slave was about two-thirds the value of a prime slave; therefore her value was estimated at $337.50. Clearly, when William Simmon transferred the slave family to David Yonge, the motive that influenced him to sell the slaves went beyond the incentive for profit. In another example, Margaret Wilson of Charleston City purchased her daughter, Martha, for the nominal sum of one dollar in 1823.10

However, the black parents who purchased their offspring for a nominal sum of money comprised a small percentage of the parents who bought their children. Most black parents were forced to pay a considerable amount of money for the freedom of their children. In 1799, Sarah, a free mulatto of Charlestown, paid 200 pounds sterling for her three-year-old daughter, Henrietta. In many instances, free black parents paid more than the current market value for their slave children. Thomas Charnock, for instance, paid more than the actual value for his son, George Charnock, in 1809. In that year, he purchased the boy for $400. However, the market value then current for a prime male slave was about $500 in Charleston City. And a young male child was worth about one-half the value of a prime slave. So the market price of young George Charnock should have been about $250. Yet, Thomas Charnock paid over the selling price for a slave child by $150. Also, in 1811, Tisey Hawie of Charleston City paid $95 over the market value of her daughter, Marie. In that year, female children were selling for $275. But Tisey Hawie purchased her daughter for $370."

Since the value of slaves fluctuated, the market price never remained at a fixed amount of money. Consequently the inflated prices paid by free black parents for their children could be attributed to fluctuations in the market place rather than the sellers taking advantage of a captive buyer. But for many black parents, the price for the freedom of their loved ones surpassed their limited earning capacity, and they were faced with a major dilemma.

In many instances, free black men were confronted by the problem of whether to purchase their children or their wives. Since children inherited the status of their mothers, the free men occasionally chose to buy their spouses to prevent any subsequent offspring from becoming the property of their wives' owners. They

later purchased any of their children who remained in servitude. So when Josey, a free black man of St. John's Parish, purchased his wife, Clarinda, he was aware that his children born after the transaction would not be the property of his wife's former master.' 2

After the free black men purchased their spouses, the next step was to acquire the freedom of their children, but that task was often an ordeal. For example, when Peter Parlar of Charleston City purchased his wife, Rebecca Parlar, he then attempted to buy the freedom of his daughter, Hannah. However, he could not accomplish that task while Hannah was still a child. Fortunately, their daughter was not separated from them and continued to live in Charleston City, so Peter and Rebecca Parlar could visit her. Even though they occasionally saw their child, the couple still desired to obtain the freedom of their beloved daughter, but the financial burden was difficult for them to bear. So Peter Parlar requested that after his death, his house and lot on Radcliffe Street in Charleston Neck should be sold and "the proceeds thereof [used] in purchasing through a Trustee or Trustees my daughter Hannah now the property of Mrs. Lartouch..."" His request was made on May 2, 1833. Within two weeks after his declaration was issued, he died, and his executors began the process to settle his estate and carry out his last request."

Unfortunately for a few free blacks, their dying pleas were not always adhered to by their executors. In 1834, for example, John Porte of Charleston City requested that:

> The little worldly substance that I am possessed of should be appropriated to the use of my two children Mary and Eliza who are Infants ... of Rebecca a Slave of Thomas Lowndes Esquire. For this purpose I give all my money and goods to my Executors hereinafter named ... to be applied in purchasing the freedom of the said two children and bring them up in the world as well as circumstances will admit ..."

In order to ensure that his requests were honored, he selected two trusted friends, John Francis and John Lee, to implement his demands. 16 Mr. Porte hoped that within a reasonable amount of time the capital secured from his estate, once invested, would eventually allow his executors to purchase his beloved children. Yet nine years after his death, the freedom of Mary and Eliza had not been obtained by his executors. Furthermore, the prospect of his offspring's freedom appeared somewhat in doubt. But strangely enough, the owner of the two slave girls brought a suit against the executors of John Porte in

the Court of Equity.

In March 1843, Thomas Lowndes filed a claim against John Francis and John Lee for not honoring the requests of John Porte. In the suit, Lowndes said that he was willing to respect the provisions of John Porte's last will and testament and to sell the slave children to the trustees of the said girls in order that they might be freed from slavery. But the executors of John Porte refused to appropriate the money from the estate of the deceased man for the designated purposes of the will."

After hearing the case, the court ruled that John Francis and John Lee must pay to James Louis Petique (the surviving trustee of the slave children of John Porte) the sum of $778.38, to be applied by the trustee to the purposes of the will. It is quite likely that the money from the estate of John Porte was turned over to James Louis Petique and invested, thereby facilitating the purchase of Mary and Eliza Porte."

In general, free black parents who attempted to buy their families were confronted with many obstacles, making it extremely difficult for them to free their loved ones from servitude.

One obstacle which confronted many black parents occurred when several of their children were born in slavery. Even though they desired to see all of their offspring freed from servitude, the sustained effort needed to buy their entire family was too great a burden for them to withstand. So they often decided to purchase one or two of their children and prayed that someday they would be able to acquire the freedom of their remaining offspring. Quite often, their prayers were not answered, and their other children remained in slavery. For example, George Lawrence of Charleston Neck was able to free his son, Charles Lawrence, from servitude. However, upon the death of George Lawrence, he still had slave children who were not owned by him. Unfortunately, the small estate owned by the colored man could not purchase his loved ones. As a consequence, the offspring of George Lawrence were doomed to remain slaves. Although it pained the parents to see their children in slavery, they were pleased to know that at least one or two of their offspring were no longer the slaves of another man. Also, many parents were comforted by the prayers that their children who were freed from the hands of slavery would buy the liberty of their brothers and sisters in servitude.19

In many instances, the children of free blacks did seek to continue the struggle of their parents and obtain the freedom of their

brothers and sisters who were slaves. In 1823, for example, Maria Chapman Moore of Charleston City purchased her brother, Dublin, from John Taylor. Elsewhere in the vicinity, Nat Ball, a tailor from Charleston Neck, bought his sister from Edward Simons for $300 in 1835.20 But the financial obstacles confronted by free black siblings did not always permit them to purchase their brothers and sisters who remained in slavery. Although they wanted to see them emancipated from servitude, the money needed to accomplish that desire could not be raised. Julia Cox of Charleston City found that the financial difficulties which faced her could not be conquered, and so she could not buy the freedom of her sister. Consequently, one sibling remained a slave while the other was free. Yet the plight of that beloved sister touched the heart of Julia Cox. As her sister remained in servitude and gave birth to several children, the bond between the siblings appears to have intensified. Julia Cox finally requested that her estate should be sold and the proceeds given to the children of her deceased sister. Even though she desired that all of her nieces and nephews should be freed, the liquidation of her property could not facilitate her wishes. As a result, she requested that the money from the sale of her estate should be used for the personal consumption of her nieces and nephews.21 By and large, the bond of kinship was the motivating force which caused many free blacks to purchase slaves. However, the ties of kinship were not always sufficient to overcome the lack of funds needed to purchase their beloved offspring.

Among free black parents, there still existed an undying faith that their children would be freed from slavery. Occasionally they received the aid of their own parents to help them purchase the freedom of their children. In 1784, for example, Mary Jones of Charlestown purchased the son of her daughter, Betty, for 30 guineas. In another example, Ann Snelling bought her granddaughter from James Lee for 100 guineas in 1802.22

In spite of the persistence of many free black parents and grandparents, they could not always obtain the freedom of their kinsfolk. For instance, Bess Mclntoish, a free black woman of Charleston City, worked for many years to purchase the freedom of her daughter, but the money needed to accomplish that goal could not be acquired. So her child grew up as a slave while she remained a free person. Yet the frustrations of having a child in slavery and not being able to obtain that child's freedom prodded Bess to liberate her child from the chains of slavery. According to the master of her daughter, she "secreted" her child to freedom on December 12, 1825.23 Although such acts of bravery occurred, the majority of free black parents who had slave offspring sought to free their children legally

from servitude.

Once those fortunate black parents purchased their beloved children, they usually manumitted them. In 1785, Carolina, a colored butcher of Charlestown, emancipated his son, Quash, after the child was purchased from John McQueen for 200 pounds sterling. In another example, Sam, a colored hairdresser of Charleston City, manumitted his wife, Abigail; his children, Sam, Rose, Abigail, and Joe; and his granddaughter, Elizabeth, the child of Rose, in 1790. However, some free blacks procrastinated before they emancipated their loved ones. For instance, Peter Elwig of Charleston City, purchased his wife, Amelia, from James Richardson for $400 in April 1817. Yet he waited for two years before he freed his beloved wife in August 1819.24

But for many free blacks, the privilege of emancipating their loved ones turned into a distant dream. In 1800, the state assembly passed a statute which restricted personal manumission. According to the law, the slaves who were scheduled to be freed should be capable of supporting themselves. In other words, the slaves who were to be manumitted should have a trade or a means to function economically in the society. Consequently, free blacks who purchased their children could not emancipate them until their offspring reached maturity and were capable of supporting themselves.

In response to the Act of 1800, free black parents apprenticed their children to artisans in order that they could be freed from the legal bond of slavery. In 1802, Abraham Jacobs, a caterer of Charleston City, was aware that when he purchased his children, Mary, Sarah, and Moses, he could not immediately manumit them. Yet he also knew that if his children were properly trained in a trade their chances of being emancipated were quite good. So Jacobs had his children apprenticed to facilitate their manumission.21 In the meantime, there existed the distinct danger that all of his hard work and sacrifices encountered to buy his children could be eliminated by a single financial mishap. According to the laws of the state, slaves were defined as property and subject to be seized and sold for the debts of their owners. Since the state considered all slaves as property, the relatives held by free blacks could be seized and sold for the debts of their black owners.

The precarious financial situation of free blacks caused them to incur debts which could not be paid without the seizure of their property. Since the overwhelming majority of free blacks who owned relatives were dependent upon the white community for their

livelihood, when the society at large suffered economically, the free black population faced severe economic problems. In Charleston City and Charleston Neck, for example, the black entrepreneurs needed the patronage of white customers, but when economic recessions reduced their business, they often could not pay their bills and thereby prompted their creditors to seize their property.26

During the early nineteenth century, the jubilation which overwhelmed many black parents when they purchased their offspring from `ole massa' soon turned to fear. As the parents of slave children waited to emancipate their children legally, they jeopardized the freedom of those children when they incurred debts which could not be paid. For many black parents, there existed a numbing fear that their beloved children would be seized and sold by their creditors before they could be emancipated. Also, those black parents who were ill worried that if they died their offspring would be sold by their creditors. Fearing that their children would be sold, many black parents developed methods to protect their loved ones as they waited to manumit them.

When Titus Gregorie purchased his son, Aberdeen, and his daughter, Elizabeth, he was aware that his financial troubles could affect the freedom of his children. Titus Gregorie probably went through many sleepless nights worrying about how he could protect his children from being seized and sold for his debts. Perhaps after seeking council from a trusted friend, he determined how to resolve the worrisome problem of ensuring the freedom that he sought to grant his two children. On March 19, 1808, he enacted his decision and transferred his two children to James Gregorie for the nominal sum of one dollar. Clearly, the sale transacted by Titus Gregory was an act of love and concern for his offspring rather than a commercial exchange for profit. Since the sale was for a nominal sum of money, he was not seeking financial benefits but merely the safety of his loved ones. Before the sale was concluded, he requested that certain conditions must be adhered to after the transaction. Their agreement stipulated that the children of Titus Gregorie would remain in the household of their father. Also, when the children were capable of supporting themselves, they would be emancipated by James Gregorie. Furthermore, the trust stipulated that the children would not be sold for the debts of the parties involved in the sale. In spite of the contract between the two parties, the agreement was an extralegal transaction which could be broken by James Gregorie.27

In essence, the contract was based on the trust of Titus Gregorie in the honesty of his trustee. Fortunately for Titus Gregorie, his

assessment of the character of James Gregorie was correct. In fact, after they reached maturity and were capable of supporting themselves the offspring of Titus Gregorie were freed from the stigma of chattel. In 1823, Aberdeen and Elizabeth Gregorie were living in the household of their father and reported to be free blacks by the city tax collector. In 1850, Aberdeen Gregorie was recorded as a free black by the federal census marshal of Charleston Neck.2S

Like Titus Gregorie, many free blacks were fearful that their children would be sold for their unpaid bills, and so they sold their offspring for nominal sums of money under the express conditions that their children would be manumitted.

In spite of the Act of 1800, free blacks continued to buy their children, even though they were doubtful that the freedom granted to their loved ones could be protected. For example, Peter McKinney of Charleston City purchased his daughter, Nancy, from John Chichestor for $500 in 1805. After the purchase, he did not establish a trust to protect his daughter. McKinney, like many parents who owned their offspring was probably uncertain that a trust would be honored. Parents like McKinney held their children as their legal property until manumission became possible. In the meantime, their children were in jeopardy if they encountered any unpaid debts. But the unwavering faith of black parents compelled them to hold the title to their children, and the impending fear that their children would be seized and sold for unpaid debts did not deter them from buying their offspring.29

Occasionally the parents of slave children legally manumitted their offspring while their children were minors. For example, George Mathews, a free black and a carpenter of Charleston City, purchased his daughter and his two grandchildren named Binah and Hercules in 1817. Mathews not only manumitted his daughter but freed his two grandchildren, who were minors.30 Although the Act of 1800 stipulated that slaves who were not capable of supporting themselves should not be emancipated, the statute was not always enforced by the local officials. For that reason, slaveholders like George Mathews manumitted their minors. However, there was no guarantee that the law would be loosely enforced for all free blacks.

By 1820 the state legislature began to reassess its policy on manumission. The legislators were of the opinion that the liberal usages of manumission had increased the free black community to numbers which were perceived as a threat to the safety of the white society. In South Carolina, between 1790 and 1800, the free black

population increased by 76.8 percent. After 1800 the community continued to grow by substantial levels. In fact, the population grew by 42.9 percent between 1800 and 1810 and by 49.9 percent between 1810 and 1820. As the free black community grew, many legislators became concerned about the increasing numbers of colored persons. During the legislative session of 1820, the assembly debated the issue of repealing the privilege of private manumission. By the latter part of the session, the state assembly had revoked the privilege of emancipating slaves for individual slaveowners and given the function to the legislators. As a legislative function, the number of manumitted slaves sharply declined. In 1822, for example, the state legislature granted only six out of 22 petitions for emancipation. After that date, the number of manumissions was even smaller."

The majority of free blacks who owned slave relatives and friends were adversely affected by the Act of 1820. As a result of the statute, they could not manumit their loved ones and friends in South Carolina. They were forced to own their kinsfolk and friends as their property. However, they did not treat them as chattel but as beloved relatives and friends. Yet the Act of 1820 created a legal barrier between them and their slaves. For example, free black slaveholders could not legally give or sell property to their slaves. In addition, the slave wife of a free black man was not entitled to inherit her husband's estate. Also, if her husband died intestate and having no legal or free heirs, the property of her husband was escheatable, transferable to the state or to creditors. Unfortunately, the slave wife would be included among her husband's property and would be seized and sold to the highest bidder.

For many free blacks, the statute of 1820 placed their nominal slaves in great peril. Since the law prevented free blacks from issuing deeds of manumission, they had to hold their loved ones as property. Once the stigma of chattel was placed upon the heads of their relatives and friends, the probability that their loved ones would be seized and sold for their debts became apparent to many slaveholders. In fact, after 1820, the black slaveholders of Charleston City and its vicinities were confronted with periodic economic crises which resulted in the confiscation of their real estate and slaves.

In many instances, black slaveholders had their property seized and sold for nominal sums of money. In 1833, Charles Henry, a free black slaveholder of Charleston Neck, was forced to sell his property on the corner of Cumming and Radcliff streets to pay overdue city taxes which amounted to only $2.43.32 In Charleston City, Joshua Wilson, a colored butcher, had to sell his house on Henrietta Street to

pay local taxes for $3.38 in 1835.33 However, not all of the confiscations were directed by the city government. Usually free black slaveowners borrowed money from associates and could not repay the loans, therefore their creditors filed a claim against them in the Court of Common Pleas. In 1831, for example, Smart Simpson of Charleston City received from George Buist a loan for $600. When Simpson could not repay the loan, the Court of Common Pleas placed a lien on his property. As another example, in 1835, Sally Johnston was ordered to sell her real estate to repay the loan she obtained from C.P. Gordon for $200.34

The seizures and sales ordered by the local officials were not always confined to real estate. The sale of slaves occasionally occurred. In 1827, for example, the Charleston City Council ordered that George Mathews, a free black, must sell his slave named Peggy to pay overdue workhouse expenses. On October 26, 1827, Peggy was sold to Mrs. Elizabeth McKenzie for $215.33 George Mathews probably allowed the sale of Peggy because she was a troublesome worker. Since Peggy was sold for workhouse expenses, it is likely that she had been sentenced to the Charleston Workhouse for running away or for other disciplinary reasons.

The seizure and sale of slaves were not always desired by black slaveholders. In October 1836, William and George McKinlay, free colored men and tailors of Charleston City, purchased the following slaves: John Douglass, his wife, Susan, and their children, Robert, Mary, John, Susan, Allice, Rebecca, Ann, and Edward, from Charles A. Magwood for $1,160.60. When William McKinlay and his brother, George McKinlay, purchased the Douglass family, their intentions were only to hold the legal title to the slave family and to allow them to interact as free persons; however, the legal status of the family was still defined as chattel and subject to the debts incurred by the McKinlay brothers. In fact, four years after the purchase of the slave family, the Charleston Courier reported that one member of the Douglass family was to be sold. On September 3, 1840, the Courier advertised that a slave girl about eleven years old belonging to William McKinlay was scheduled to be auctioned for overdue city taxes which amounted to only $19. The proposed sale was to take place on September 7, 1840.36 Within two days after the Courier reported the auction of the slave girl named Rebecca Douglass, the following response appeared.

> The Subscriber who is advertised to be sold by the City Sheriff as the slave of William McKinley for City Taxes, hereby gives

notices that she is a free and not the property of McKinley. Any sale by the Sheriff will be illegal and give no title to the purchaser.

Rebecca Douglass"

The response placed in the Courier on the behalf of the slave child was probably written by William McKinlay. Since he was the nominal owner of the Douglass family, he committed himself to protect the freedom of the slave family. William McKinlay, therefore, did not approve of the sale of Rebecca Douglass and sought to prevent the auction.

The prompt response by William McKinlay may have prevented what appeared to be the certain sale of Rebecca Douglass. For instance, on the day of the proposed sale, she was not advertised to be sold in the Charleston Courier or the Charleston Mercury. Usually the city sheriff placed an advertisement for the auction of property in the local newspapers on the day of the sale, but that was not the case for Rebecca Douglass. The absence of the notice suggests that the sale was withdrawn. Furthermore, there was no recorded bill of sale which transferred the girl to a new owner. So the auction of Rebecca Douglass may never have taken place. But by and large, the dilemma confronted by William McKinlay represents one of the many problems encountered by nominal slaveholders.

Lamb Stevens, a black planter of St. James & Goose Creek Parish, defended the freedom of his slave family against a swindler. In the Charleston Court of Equity, he filed a complaint against Christian Alfs in June 1851. In the suit, he charged that Alfs tricked him into transferring his granddaughter and her child to Alfs. In the court testimony, he described the situation which led to the fraudulent transfer. Lamb Stevens recalled that because his granddaughter was having marital problems and refused to live peaceably with her husband to resolve the conflict, he allowed Phoebe and her child to leave the parish and find employment in Charleston Neck. In October 1850, his granddaughter began to work for Christian Alfs as a maid. While in the employment of Alfs, she was accused of stealing some gold from a white woman who lived with her employer. When Lamb Stevens was informed of the charges against his granddaughter, he became fearful that if Phoebe were convicted she would be severely punished (the law stipulated between 20 and 50 lashes for the guilty party). In order to protect his granddaughter from that punishment, he was persuaded by Christian Alfs to sign a false bill of sale for Phoebe and her child, thus transferring the slavestoAlfs. Lamb Stevens

transferred his loved ones to Alfs because he believed that a slave who was owned by a black man would not receive justice in the courts; if the owner was a white man, then justice would not be perverted. So Stevens transferred his nominal slaves to Alfs, but under the assurance that his loved ones would be protected by the pretended buyer. In fact, Lamb Stevens demanded that Alfs sign a document which stipulated that as soon as the trial was resolved his loved ones would be returned to him and the bill of sale in Alfs' possession would be destroyed.

In spite of the demands made by Lamb Stevens, the agreement between the two parties was broken, and Christian Alfs used the bill of sale to claim ownership of the nominal slaves. Once Lamb Stevens discovered that his loved ones would not be returned to him, he filed a suit against Alfs for fraud.

In June 1851, the case of Lamb Stevens vs. Christian Alfs was heard by the Court of Equity. In court testimony, Lamb Stevens said that he signed a false bill of sale for his granddaughter Phoebe and her child, thus transferring them to Alfs. But the transfer was to protect Phoebe from the perils of a trial which might convict her for stealing from a white woman. He also maintained that the transaction was not an actual sale because no money was exchanged. However, Christian Alfs told the court that he actually purchased the slaves from Lamb Stevens and paid $300. Consequently, he believed that the bill of sale was a legal document. The counselor for Lamb Stevens refuted the testimony of Alfs by providing the sworn statement of Thomas S. Knight, a witness to the transaction. Knight, a neighbor of Lamb Stevens, was at the home of the colored man when the alleged sale occurred. He recalled that Stevens had signed the bill of sale in order to defend Phoebe against the charge of theft, and he also said that no money was exchanged between the two parties.38 After the conclusion of the testimonies, Judge Benjamin F. Dunkin rendered his decision. The judge ruled that

> According to the testimony now before the court the transaction on the parts of the defendant is one of the most unblushing attempts to perpetrate fraud and pervert the cause of justice that has stained the records of the country.
>
> It is ordered and decreed that the defendant deliver up to the complainant the slave Pheobe and her child Sally ...39

The plight of Lamb Stevens and his granddaughter demonstrates the uncertainties which confronted black slaveholders when they tried to

maintain the freedom of their loved ones. Since the state legislature denied black slaveholders the privilege of emancipating their nominal slaves without the consent of the assembly, they were forced to hold their loved ones as their legal property. Furthermore, the slaveholders who owned female kinsfolk saw the burden of slavery inherited by the offspring of their slave women. Many black slaveholders feared for the safety of their kinsfolk who were slaves and so attempted to maintain their freedom by legal, extralegal, and illegal means.

By 1820, free blacks were required to petition the state assembly to manumit their slave relatives and friends legally. In many cases, they sought the services of white agents to represent their claims. These agents drafted and presented petitions to the state legislature in Columbia, South Carolina. In the document, the desire of the petitioner to manumit his loved ones was expressed. Usually the petitioner provided the signature of several prominent citizens in his community who attested to the character of the slaveowner and his slave relatives. Once a petition was completed, the agent presented the document to a special committee of the state legislature. The petition had to clear the special committee concerning slave emancipations before reaching the floor of the House of Representatives. In the committee, the request was examined to determine if the case warranted a special act of legislation. If the committee deemed the request to be worthy of consideration, a bill to manumit the slave was written and introduced to the legislature. But both houses of the assembly had to approve the statute by a majority vote before the bill became a law and the slave was emancipated. However, the overwhelming majority of the petitions never reached the floor of either the House or the Senate but died in the special committee. After the petition failed to receive the approval of the committee, the only recourse was to present another request during the next legislative session. Regrettably, the petitions of all of the black slaveholders were rejected by the committee. So many free blacks were forced to continue to hold their loved ones as chattel. Yet the difficulties associated with obtaining a successful petition did not deter them from attempting legally to free their loved ones from the stigma of property.4°

When manumission became a state function, numerous petitions from free blacks poured into the legislature. In 1823, William N. Mitchell, the executor of the deceased James Powell, Sr., who was a free black of St. John's Berkeley Parish, presented a petition to the special committee for the emancipation of the son of the colored man. According to the petition, Powell had directed his executor to

manumit his son. Powell was unable to free the boy prior to the adoption of the statute which banned private manumission because his son was a minor, incapable of supporting himself and thereby ineligible for emancipation. By the time his son was capable of earning a livelihood, manumission became a legislative function. As a consequence, Powell could not emancipate his son. So before his death, he directed his executor to manumit his son, James Powell, Jr. William N. Mitchell adhered to the request and petitioned the state legislature for the emancipation of James Powell, Jr. Regrettably, the petition of Mitchell was rejected by the special committee. The committee members maintained that there was no special reason presented by the petitioner to warrant a bill of manumission."

The opinion of the special committee was that only slaves who performed heroic deeds should be manumitted (in 1822 they approved the emancipation of Peter Desverneys for disclosing the Denmark Vesey Conspiracy). By 1823, the committee had firmly established the principle that manumission was a special privilege granted only in rare circumstances.42

In spite of the unlikely prospect of manumission, free blacks continued to petition the state legislature for the freedom of their loved ones. In 1828, 1830, and 1838, James Patterson, a free black from Columbia City, petitioned the assembly to free his wife and children. Patterson had worked as a carpenter and earned a sufficient amount of money to buy his wife, Sally, and his son, George. While he permitted his family to interact as free persons, the stigma of slavery remained with his loved ones as long as they were chattel. Since his family members were slaves, they would not be entitled to inherit his estate, and after his death, the state of quasifreedom that he granted his family would be in jeopardy. To ensure the freedom of his loved ones, he petitioned the state assembly in 1828. However, his first petition was rejected by the special committee on the grounds that he did not present a case to show that his family should be freed .41

Although James Patterson's first petition was denied, he did not end his quest to emancipate his loved ones. He presented another petition to the legislature in 1830. But once again his request was rejected by the stubborn committee. After the second denial, James Patterson went home a somewhat disappointed soul. Perhaps it became apparent to him that the only way he could ensure the freedom of his family was to leave his birthplace and move to a free state. But the pain of leaving his native land and a successful business was difficult to bear while manumission was still possible. So the prospect of flight became an unlikely alternative for him. As long as

there was a glimmer of hope that his family would be freed, he did not lose his faith .44

Eight years after his second petition, James Patterson again asked the assembly to free his loved ones. In 1838, he petitioned the legislature to emancipate his family. His third petition had the endorsement of many prominent white citizens of Columbia City. Among the signers were Jos. A. Black, James Boatwright, John Bryce, James Guignard, Alex Kird, B.F. Taylor, and Andrew Wallace.4 In the petition, he reiterated the poignant request that he had made a decade before.

> Wherefore your Petitioner most humbly entreats your Honorable body to manumit the said Slaves Sarah Patterson, George Patterson, and Mary Patterson so that the honest industry the unwearied pains and unaltering efforts of a father and husband may not be loosed to him entirely and your Petitioner will ever pray.46

In spite of the touching request, the committee still denied the petition of James Patterson. In fact, the committee maintained that

> It would be inexpedient except as a reward for great and distinguished merit, to depart from the principles and policy of the law which forbids the emancipation of slaves. However great may be the merit of the present petitioner, your committee are of opinion that is not such as to call for an extra ordinary act of favor on the part of this legislature, and nothing has been offered to show, that the wife and children of the petitioner ... has any claims whatsoever to the interposition of the legislature in the behalf- your committee therefore recommend that the prayer of the petitioner be rejected."

A decade after James Patterson submitted his first petition, the legislature had not changed its views on manumission. The committee members were so afraid that one exception would cause a flood of petitions from slaveholders who held the legal title to their wives, husbands, concubines, and children that the committee would not depart from a strict adherence to the law. So after three petitions, James Patterson could not obtain the freedom of his family by legislation.

Although James Patterson's petitions were rejected, his association with some of the prominent citizens of Columbia City

ensured that the freedom he permitted his family would be continued. In 1850, for example, his wife, Sally Patterson, was reported by the federal enumerator as a free woman of color. Also, she owned not only real estate valued at $1,200 but two female slaves. And her two children, George and Mary Patterson, were listed as free persons of color and living in the household of their mother. In spite of the legislature's refusal to emancipate the Patterson family, they continued to interact as free colored persons after the death of James Patterson." Clearly the city officials circumvented the authority of the special committee and allowed the defacto free black family to live as free persons.

The stubbornness of the special committee was not perpetual. The committee's principles were occasionally compromised. The petition of Mose Irvine is a perfect example of legislative compromise. Before his petition was presented to the committee, he purchased his wife, Harriet, and their two children, Mary and Martha, from Mary Russell for $300 in 1828. One year after the purchase of his family, he petitioned the legislature to emancipate his loved ones. But his emotional request was denied by the special committee in 1829. Upon hearing the decision, a dejected Mose Irvine returned to his home on Logan Street and planned his next move. When his request was refused, he was aware that another petition made during the next legislative session would be fruitless .49 For that reason, he was.forced to bide his time and pray that the legislature would change its mind. So he waited, and after six years of steadfastness, he once again asked the committee to emancipate his beloved family.

Mose Irvine doubted that his request for the emancipation of his family would be granted; therefore, he presented an alternative petition. He asked that his family should be permitted to own his real estate, if the committee chose not to manumit his loved ones. In December 1836, the committee considered the request and concluded that Irvine's family should not be emancipated; however, they did concede that the slave fam- ?ly should be given the privilege of owning property. When the committee approved the second provision, a bill was drafted to authorize the slave family of Mose Irvine to own property.'°

On December 21, 1836, the state assembly passed a bill to permit "the children of Mose Irvine and Harriet, his wife ... to take by descent or devise or purchase, the estate of the said Mose Irvine and to follow the condition of their father Mose Irvine."" The legislature passed by the assemblymen slightly departed from the policy of the assembly.

To Mose Irvine, the legislation was quite inadequate. Even though his loved ones were given the right to own property, they were legally his chattel. Furthermore, when he died, his family could still be confiscated by the state as vacant property or seized by his creditor for unpaid bills. By 1842, he had even lost confidence in the bill passed to permit his family to own property. In his will, he stated:

> I give my house and lot in Logan Street to C.M. Furman and A.C. Smith and their heirs forever In trust nevertheless for the use and purposes following that is to say In trust to permit ... my Wife and children to reside therein during the life time of my Wife or to apply the income of the same to support my Wife and children ...32

All in all, the legislation passed by the assembly did little to alleviate the dilemma faced by Mose Irvine.

The legislature's firm commitment against manumission can be demonstrated by the case of George Wilson, alias George Watkins. In 1822, he was emancipated by the state assembly for his part in disclosing the Denmark Vesey Slave Plot. About three years after Wilson received his freedom, he purchased his wife, Jenny, and their son, Sampson, from L.S. Campbell for $100. After ten years of holding the title to his family, he decided that the only way his loved ones could be protected from his creditors was by an act of legislation. In 1835, he petitioned the legislature to emancipate his wife and son. But his request was denied by the committee." In spite of the loyal service he provided the white community when he gave important information which prevented the Denmark Vesey Slave Revolt, he could not persuade the committee to sponsor a bill to emancipate his family.

When the petition of George Wilson was denied, the prospect for all black slaveholders seemed quite doubtful. In fact, between 1821 and 1838, the legislature emancipated fewer than 15 slaves in the state." The slaves manumitted during the period mentioned were freed for heroic deeds. In many instances, they informed their masters of slave conspiracies and were rewarded with their freedom. But the slaves who were owned by relatives seldom received their liberty by acts of legislation. In short, the free blacks who attempted to free their loved ones by the political process were doomed to certain failure.

Many black slaveholders therefore used an assortment of schemes to protect the freedom they granted their loved ones who were their property when the state legislature refused to emancipate their slave

relatives and friends. As manumission became unlikely, nominal slaveholders established deeds of trust between themselves and family members, prominent free blacks, and white citizens. In the deeds, they transferred the legal title of their nominal slaves to a trustee or trustees. Although the trustee was given the legal title to the nominal slaves, the trust stipulated that certain provisions must be adhered to by the trustee or the slaves would revert back to the original owner or to other trustees. Usually the deeds required the trustee to permit the slaves to interact as though they were free blacks. In addition, the nominal slaves could not be seized and sold for the debts of the former or present owners. In practice, the trusts were established by slaveholders to protect their slave relatives and friends from possible seizure for their debts and to ensure their nominal slaves a degree of freedom when the slaveholders died.

In spite of the questionable legality of the trust, free blacks used the deeds to protect the freedom of their loved ones. In fact, between 1822 and 1864, numerous trusts were recorded in the Secretary of State's Office in Columbia, South Carolina, by free blacks as well as white slaveholders. Furthermore, many trusts were secretly established and therefore were not recorded. In short, when free blacks could not emancipate their loved ones who were their chattel, they used extralegal as well as illegal means to provide a degree of freedom for their slave relatives and friends.

In 1823, James Hopton Marsh, a free black of Charleston City, established a deed of trust to protect the freedom of his mother. Prior to the trust, he purchased his mother, Abby Hopton, from Robert and Harriet L. Howard for $800 in 1821. Two years after the purchase, he became concerned that the freedom granted to his mother could not be protected by himself. So Marsh transferred his mother to Robert Howard, the former owner of the female slave, for five dollars. However, the trust explicitly stipulated that Abigail Hopton would not be subject to the control of Robert Howard, thereby granting her the liberty of movement and thus nominal freedom. But the nominal slave was required to pay to Robert Howard the sum of one dollar annually for slave taxes. When James Marsh sold his mother to Robert Howard, he made the transaction to protect his mother from being seized and sold for his unpaid bills."

In another example, Jeremiah L. Espinard, a free colored man of Charleston City, feared that his death was imminent, so he sold his wife to a free colored man to ensure her freedom. In the trust, he stated:

> I Jeremiah L. Espinard, a free man of color of the city of Charleston ... have always experienced the most faithful and affectionate conduct from Kitty a female negro woman slave belonging to me. And whereas it is my wish to make provision as will secure to her comfort and protection whilst she lives being unable by law to execute a deed of emancipation in her favour ...
>
> I Jeremiah L. Espinard for and in consideration of the sum of five dollars to me in hand paid by the said Jacob Weston ... sell unto the said Jacob Weston a negro Female slave named Kitty.
>
> Jacob Weston will at no time nor on any occasion whatsoever demand or require from ... Kitty more than ... 50 cents per annu ... or sum as may be necessary for the payment of taxes ...f6

After Jeremiah L. Espinard sold his wife to Jacob Weston, he also transferred the furniture in his home to Weston for the benefit of his beloved wife. According to the trust, he stipulated that

> I Jeremiah L. Espinard a free man of color ... for in consideration of the sum of one dollar ... paid by Jacob Weston also a free man of color ... sold ... the following household furniture ... two moss Mattresses, one feather bed, one set of drawers, one pine bedstead, one Mahogany Dining table, one small Mahogany tea table, light setting chairs, house on Wentworth Street in the City of Charleston ...
>
> In trust nevertheless and to and for the sole, separate and exclusive use benefit and behalf of my wife Kitty with full power to sell and dispose of the same or such part thereof as it may be expedient to sells?

Trusts established between close colored friends occurred quite frequently in the state. These extralegal agreements were usually honored by the colored trustees.

Many black slaveholders allowed trusted white friends to hold the legal title of their loved ones. In Sumter County, William Ellison, a free colored man, established a deed of trust with his reliable white associate to protect the freedom of his daughter, Maria Ellison. When he purchased his daughter from Dr. David Gilliens, the Act of 1820 prohibited slaveholders from issuing deeds of manumission to free

their loved ones. Consequently, William Ellison could not legally emancipate his daughter without the consent of the state assembly. To ensure the safety of his beloved child, he established a deed of trust with Col. William McCreighton. On November 18, 1830, he transferred the legal title of his daughter to Col. McCreighton for the nominal sum of one dollar. Yet the trust explicitly stipulated that Maria Ellison was to live with her father, who could free her when the state changed the statute against personal manumission or could manumit the slave girl outside the state's jurisdiction. But more importantly, Maria Ellison could not be seized and sold for the debts of either William Ellison or Col. McCreighton. Even though the legal title to Maria Ellison was transferred to McCreighton, the special provisions of the trust ensured her safety as long as the trustee fulfilled his obligations. In the case of Col. McCreighton, he honored his commitment and permitted the slave girl to act as a free person."

Maria Ellison was a de facto free black. For example, she left Stateburg Township under her own power and traveled to Fairfield County, where she married Henry Jacobs (a free man of color and a carriage maker). In the federal census of 1850, she was listed as a free woman of color, yet no legal document was issued by the legislative body to sanction the freedom of Maria Ellison. In fact, William Ellison was so sure of the nominal freedom of his daughter that upon his death, he bequeathed to her the sum of $500.99 By and large, when the deeds of trust were adhered to, the slaves were allowed to live as though they had been born of free parents.

Some black slaveholders did not think that their trustees would honor the agreements, and so they established intricate provisions within the trusts to protect their loved ones. Elizabeth Taylor, a free colored woman of Charleston City, created an elaborate provision in her trust to protect her beloved husband. In the trust, she stated:

> I the said Elizabeth Taylor shall have the use and enjoy the services of the said Mulatto fellow Abram Taylor for and during my natural life and it is herein and hereby expressly agreed and understood that the sum of five Dollars to me paid annually shall be in full fair and equalent compensation for the said use and service of the said Abram Taylor and after my death for the use and benefit of Rev. Gentleman ... Rector of St. Philips Church ... the said Christopher Panis ... shall not require or compel that said Abram Taylor to pay more than two Dollars a year wages nor shall they the said Trustees ... attempt by an application to the Court of Equity or by any legal provision whatsoever to sell barter or exchange the said

> Abram Taylor nor shall they or either of them attempt to send or force the said Abram Taylor to leave or remove from this City or State unless it truly his own desire and with his own consent ...
>
> But should the said Christopher Panis trustee aforesaid his heirs Executors or Administrators or any other person whomsoever ... the said trust and Limitations and all the Interest hereby Conveyed or intended to be conveyed shall cause and determine and the said Abram Taylor Shall pass to and be held intrust by the Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church ...'0

When Elizabeth Taylor made her trust, she was aware that her trustees could violate their agreements and sell Abram Taylor. In order to further ensure the freedom of her beloved husband, she requested that an alternative trustee should take possession of Abram Taylor, if the original trustees failed to honor their commitments. On the whole, this trust permitted Abram Taylor to interact as a free man of color as long as the document was honored by the trustees.

In the antebellum era, it was not unusual for nominal slaves to approach free blacks and request them to serve as their agents to purchase their freedom. Usually a slave worked in his spare time to earn the capital to facilitate the purchase. Once the money was raised, the agent approached the owner and negotiated a suitable price. After the purchase, the agent or technical owner permitted the slave to work and live as a free person of color.

Arrangements between slaves and free blacks to purchase their freedom were quite common in Charleston City during the 1820s and the 1830s. For example, a slave woman named Maria asked Margaret Randall, a free woman of color, to buy her freedom. Maria had saved enough money for the eventual purchase and directed her agent to negotiate a fair price with her owner. After the bargaining, it was agreed that Maria would be sold for $200. On July 18, 1829, Margaret Randall purchased the slave Maria from Sarah McPherson. Two days after the purchase, Mrs. Randall declared that "by these present do hereby forever relinquish unto the said Negro slave Maria ... all and every claim and claims of her wages unto me. "61 Sometime after the transaction Maria undoubtedly blended into the free black community.

Occasionally slaves even used free blacks to purchase their families for them. In Charleston City, Elias Beard requested that

Samuel Weston act as agent and purchase his family. Prior to the request, Elias Beard had received his freedom by the last will and testament of Plowden Weston. But the emancipation was illegal because at the time his master could not manumit him without the approval of the state assembly. That approval was not attained by the executors of Plowden Weston. Yet as a nominal slave, Beard was able to acquire the capital needed to buy his family. When Elias Beard acquired the money to purchase his loved ones, he directed Samuel Weston to buy them. On March 1, 1830, Samuel Weston purchased Rachel Beard and her two children, Georgiana and Martha, from Henry and Carolina Holmes for $700.61

While Samuel Weston held the legal title to the slave family, he still permitted them their freedom. Yet as long as he legally owned the slave family, there was the distinct possibility that the family could have been seized and sold for his debts. To ensure the safety of the Beard family, he stipulated that

> I or any person whatever claiming ... through or under me should at anytime her after claim ... or appropriate the said Rachel and her children or their services to me or their use or benefit ... I do hereby declare and acknowledge that any free person whatsoever, whether white or colored may on behalf of ... Rachel and children receive, conceal, remove out of the way and protect them or any of them against me or any person so aforesaid claiming them ...63

Like Samuel Weston, other free blacks were receptive to the requests of their black brethren in slavery and held the legal title to slaves without receiving or demanding financial benefits. Furthermore, they permitted their nominal slaves to live as free persons of color.

In the free black community, there were many individuals who allowed their nominal slaves to blend into the colored community. For many there existed an active opposition against slavery which can be seen in the deeds of trusts. For example, Smart Stoll, a tailor of Charleston City, purchased a slave girl named Susannah. After the purchase, he declared that "in consideration of the Sum of One Dollar ... paid ... by within Negro Girl Slave Susannah have ... from this date relinquish unto the said negro Girl Slave Susannah and her future issues and increase ... any and all Control and domanion over her."64 In March 1831, Priscilla North of Charleston City, purchased two brown children named Henry and John from Henry Muckinfuss of Charleston City for $190.69 Shortly later Priscilla North declared her

opposition to slavery when she said:

> Be it remembered that I Priscilla North of the City of Charleston (a free person of color) being at present the owner of two colored children viz John aged five years and Henry age three years. And whereas the Laws of the State opposed to emancipation
>
> Now know ye that inconsideration of divers, good causes me here into moving and as well as for and inconsideration of the sum of Ten Dollars to me in hand paid ... by Thomas F. Purse and Henry W. Muckinfuss. I have granted, bargained, sold and delivered ... unto the said Thomas F. Purse and Henry W. Muckinfuss the aforesaid two slaves Henry and John ... In Trust nevertheless upon this special trust and confidence that the said Thomas F. Purse and Henry W. Muckinfuss ... shall and will permit and allow the said slaves to be considered from henceforth free and discharged from the bonds of slavery and to be in no manner whatever subject to the debts contracts or engagements of myself or of ... said trustees ...66

Clearly, free blacks evaded the law against private emancipation and declared their slaves who were relatives and friends to be free from slavery. By using deeds of trust, they provided some assurance that their loved ones would be permitted to enjoy the privileges of duly emancipated slaves.

By the 1830s, the judiciary raised some serious questions about the legality of the trusts. In Thomas Linam vs. Samuel 0. Johnson, the court of appeals ruled that "if the owner without a formal act of emancipation permit his slave to go at large and to exercise all the rights and enjoy all the privileges of a free person of color the slave becomes liable to seizure as a derelict ... under the act of 1800."67 According to the act, slaves who were not duly emancipated and lived as free coloreds could be seized by free persons and used for the good of the claimer.

However, in Monk vs. Jenkins, the court ruled that a de facto free black could enjoy the privileges of a free person of color while he was at large. According to Justice William Harper, "there can be no slaves without a master, and it follows that after such irregular emancipation, until seizure is actually made, the emancipated slave must stand on the footing of any other free negro."68 In essence, the decision of Judge Harper permitted nominal slaves or de facto free

blacks to work and live as free coloreds until seizure had been made by the state or free person.

In 1841, the state legislature moved to firmly close all loopholes in the Act of 1820. The assembly passed a bill which stipulated that no slaves could be freed outside of the jurisdiction of the state by wills, deeds of trust or any other conveyances. Furthermore, article three of the statute declared:

> That any bequest, gift or conveyance of any slave or slaves, accompanied with a trust or confidence, either secret or expressed that such slave or slaves shall be held in nominal servitude only, shall be void and no effect and every donee or trustee, holding under such bequest, gift, or conveyance shall be liable to deliver up such slave or slaves or held to account for the value, for the benefit of the distributee or next of kin of the person making such bequest, gift, or conveyance.69

As the number of defacto free blacks began to grow, the legislature became fearful that these nominal slaves would blend into the free black community, thereby increasing the free ranks. In addition, the legislative power to emancipate slaves was being usurped by the trusts. Consequently, the deeds of trust were ruled to be illegal, and the slaves involved in the transactions could be seized by the next of kin or the state.

For many black slaveholders, the statute of 1841 presented them with a major dilemma. Since the statute declared that slaves involved in the trusts would be seized, some slaveholders were hesitant about establishing a deed of trust. In addition, the law even restricted slaveholders from emancipating their loved ones outside of the state. For those slaveholders who wanted legally to emancipate their loved ones, the only alternative was to petition the state legislature.

In 1845, Priscilla Jesszup of Abbeville County requested that the state legislature allow her to emancipate her beloved husband. In the petition, she stated that her husband, John Jesszup, had been the slave of Mr. Marion and by her industry she was able to purchase his freedom in 1834.70

By 1845 Priscilla Jesszup was in bad health and feared that her death was imminent. According to Jesszup, her husband would fall into other hands as a slave if she did not manumit him before her death. For that reason, she desperately wanted her husband to be emancipated so he would not be separated from their free children,

who needed the guidance of their father. But the prayers of a poor colored woman fell upon deaf ears; the Committee on the Colored Population refused to manumit her beloved husband. The committee maintained that

> There are many circumstances in this case, that should excite sympathy in behalf of the object of the petitioner yet believing it to be the true policy of the state vigilantly to guard against what might become an abuse of sympathy they unamiously recommend that a strict adherence to the statute of 1841 and accordingly recommend that the prayer of the petitioner be not granted."

By the 1840s, the state legislature had not changed its strict interpretation of the act of 1820 and therefore freed no slaves. Yet the petitions from free blacks were still presented to the committee. In 1853, William Jackson, a carpenter of Colleton County, petitioned the legislature to emancipate his family. But the request of Jackson was denied by the Committee on the Colored Population.72 In short, black slaveholders could not legally emancipate their loved ones in the state or even outside it.

The only alternative for many black slaveholders was to break the law and establish deeds of trust. In fact, many slaveholders provided for the freedom of their loved ones in this way and disregarded the statute of 1841. Shortly after the law was passed, William Cooper issued a deed of trust. In the document, he declared:

> I William Cooper of the City of Charleston for and inconsideration of the sum of ten dollars ... by Thomas Lehre ... have granted bargained sold ... a colored man named William Garden Cooper unto the said Thomas Lehre ...
>
> In Trust nevertheless to and for the following Trusts uses and purposes herein after specified What is to say that said William Garden Cooper to work out and receive, keep enjoy and dispose of the proceeds of his own labor and earnings in any manner of way he might think fit, without the control or interference of him the said Trustee and in Trust further that the said Wm Garden Cooper should not in any manner or way be subject to the debts liabilities or engagements whatsoever of the said Thomas Lehre. And in trust further that should the said William Garden Cooper desire to leave the state he shall have full power and authority to do so without any

> hinderance or molestation on the part or behalf of the said Trustee ...'3

When William Cooper made his trust, he was confident the statute of 1841 would not be enforced and that his nominal slave would be allowed to blend into the free black community.

While William Cooper openly declared his trust, other free blacks created secret deeds to protect their loved ones. In 1845, Lamb Stevens, a free black of Charleston District, sold his daughter, Judy, and her children, Robert and Rachel, to John Bemar for the nominal sum of one dollar. The sale resulted from his fear that he could not maintain the freedom of his family. Undoubtedly Stevens demanded that certain conditions must be adhered to by Bemar before the transaction was concluded. In the oral agreement, he may have stipulated that his loved ones were to have their freedom and, most importantly, that his family could not be sold for his or Bemar's debts."

In Charleston City, Francis Mishaw, a free person of color, established a similar trust to protect his loved ones. On October 25, 1847, he declared:

> I give and bequeath the colored Woman Sally who was purchased by me from Mrs. Allen D. Lowndes and her present and future issue and increase and all other property whatsoever that I may be seized or possessed of ... at the time of my death to Dr. E. Horry Deas, Dr. Peter Porcher and Philip J. Porcher Esquire ...'s

Although Francis Mishaw did not state his intentions in the will, the style of his declaration seems to suggest that the three trustees were assigned to look after his estate for the slave woman Sally. Francis Mishaw was aware that had he explicitly stated his intentions of procuring the freedom of his slaves, he would have openly violated the Act of 1841. By creating a secret trust, the probability that the agreement would be discovered was unlikely.

Throughout the 1850s and the early 1860s, the explicit and secret trusts continued to be a common means of ensuring the freedom of nominal slaves. In Charleston City, for example, Katy Ann Harleston and her daughter, Tersa, were sold to John B. Mathews, Thomas R. Small, and Edward Mick for the nomimal sum of five dollars in 1855. The trust stipulated that Katy Harleston and her child were to be treated as free persons of color.76 Elsewhere in the city of

Charleston, Cato W. Joyner was transferred to Richard E. Dereef, a free man of color, for the sum of five dollars and under the express condition that the slave would be considered as a free man." As late as 1864, trusts were being used to provide nominal slaves with a degree of freedom. Malcolm Brown, a free colored man of Charleston City, transferred the title of his woman, Rose Lavinia, and her child, Emma, to Thomas R. Small, Tobias Darison, and Thomas D. Small, in order that the slaves could be freed from the worst elements of slavery. For many black slaveholders, the law against the trusts was not enough to deter them from freeing their loved ones from slavery.71

By and large, the bond of kinship stimulated many free blacks to purchase their relatives who remained in slavery. Once they acquired their loved ones manumission usually occurred. But after 1820, free blacks could not legally emancipate their relatives and friends from slavery without the consent of the state assembly. So they used legal, extralegal, and illegal means to free their loved ones from the stigma of chattel.

Chapter Five

Neither a Slave Nor a Free Person

After 1820, hundreds of slaves were illegally manumitted by their owners in Charleston City. Among the slaves freed were relatives and friends held by free persons of color. Their colored owners allowed them to interact in the community as free persons when manumission could not be legally attained. In general, the nominal slaves owned by free blacks were bondsmen without masters because their colored owners only held their legal title and did not interfere in their ingress or egress. These nominal slaves were de facto free blacks, living and working as free persons of color. In fact, they even paid free Negro capitation taxes and owned property, including slaves. But the status of the quasi-free black was a precarious situation. According to the law, they were slaves, as were the children born to females of that status. Also, the law stipulated that the de facto free blacks could be seized and sold by the state as vacant property. Until they were caught, however, their status remained somewhere between slavery and freedom; thus they were neither slaves nor free persons.

The bond of kinship established by free black families facilitated a benevolent exchange between black slaveholders and their slave relatives. To many free blacks, the status of their loved ones who were slaves did not destroy that special bond within their families. Even though they owned their kinsfolk, the love between the free parent and the slave child did not diminish, just as the concerns and love between the free spouse and the slave spouse did not change. By and large, the personal relationship between free black slaveholders and their loved ones or nominal slaves was no different from the interaction among free relatives. The colored slaveholders regarded their loved ones as free persons and permitted them to live as free persons of color.

The relationship between Peter Elwig and his slave son Joseph Elwig is a perfect example of the interaction among free blacks and their slave kinsfolk. In 1823, Peter Elwig purchased his son Joseph and two other sons, Peter and James, from Ann Richardson for $500. After the purchase, he was unable to manumit his beloved children because the state assembly had taken the power of personal manumission away from the slave masters. Although Joseph Elwig and his brothers were the slaves of their father, the love that their father had for them did not diminish. Rather it seems to have intensified. The father reared his sons as though they were born free from slavery. When Joseph Elwig reached adolescence, his father

trained him to be a carpenter.'

By the time Joseph Elwig was 26 years old, he had enjoyed many of the privileges of free blacks. In 1836, he operated a carpenter shop in Charleston City. In that year, he was considered a free black by the city tax collector and accordingly paid free Negro capitation taxes. In 1839 he even married a free woman of color named Rebecca. Both he and his wife lived on Coming Street and paid city taxes in 1840. As Joseph Elwig interacted as a free black, he appeared to be removed from the bond of slavery and so considered himself, not the slave of his father, but a free man.2

Yet Joseph Elwig was a nominal slave. His owner was his father, but the institution of slavery was his master. In spite of the fact that he paid the same taxes that a duly emancipated slave was required to pay, he was still property. Joseph Elwig was the slave of an intolerable institution which refused to permit many devoted fathers and mothers to emancipate their beloved children from the stigma of property. The inhumane system of slavery also forced many parents to sell their own flesh and blood, though not for profit as some writers have suggested. For many black parents, the sale of their children was the supreme sacrifice of love. Many parents were aware that they could not protect the freedom granted to their children solely by themselves. So they usually transferred the legal title of their offspring to a trusted relative or a reliable friend who would not interfere in the ingress or egress of their loved ones. Yet, the whole transaction reinforced the fact that their children were merely property and had to be sold to ensure their freedom.

Like many black parents, Peter Elwig was forced to sell his son to ensure the freedom of his child. In 1843, he became ill and feared that his death was imminent. In order to prevent his son from being sold by his creditors or confiscated as vacant property, he transferred the legal title for him to Rebecca Elwig, the wife of his slave son, for the nominal sum of one dollar. After the transaction was made, the relationship between Rebecca and Joseph Elwig did not change for the worse. In 1844, the couple lived on Charlotte Street and were listed as free persons of color by the city tax collector. Furthermore, Joseph Elwig continued to operate his carpenter shop as if he were a free man as late as 1864. Clearly Joseph Elwig was not treated by his father or wife as a mere slave, but as a free person.3 For Joseph Elwig, the limitations he suffered were the result, not of a personal form of slavery between master and slave, but of an institutionalized form of bondage.

Surely the bond between parent and child was seldom disrupted by the slave status of the offspring. Indeed, the overwhelming majority of black parents did not destroy that special relationship with their children even though they maintained ownership of their offspring over a long period of time. In 1843, for example, George Lucas, a free black of Charleston Neck, purchased his three daughters named Dinah, Martha, and Georgianna from Robert Hume for $500. In 1860, George Lucas still held the title to his loved ones, but they were reported as free persons of color by the city tax collector. At his home on Nassau Street resided his wife, Josephine Lucas, and their children who were slaves. Like many black parents, Lucas refused to inform the tax collector that his offspring were slaves and should not be classified as free persons. The bond of the family was so strong that Martha and Georgianna Lucas remained in the household of their father in 1870.4

Elsewhere in Charleston Neck, Nelson Richardson purchased his wife and allowed her to live as a free person. In 1849, he bought his spouse, Ann Richardson, from Edward W. Bancroft of Charleston City for $450. Although his wife was a slave, he did not regard her as mere chattel. In 1850, for instance, he told the census enumerator that his beloved wife was a free mulatto. By 1859 he was so successful in concealing the slave status of his wife and subsequent children that he did not have to pay slave taxes on his loved ones.5

In 1853, Georgianna Alston, a colored woman of Charleston City, bought a mulatto man named Thomas from Jacob Cohen for $1,000. The slave purchased by Georgianna Alston was, in fact, her husband and not merely a laborer. In 1860, the couple was living together on Spring Street in Charleston City and reported to be free persons of color by the federal enumerator. In addition, the federal census marshal reported that Thomas Alston was the owner of $2,000 worth of real estate and personal property valued at $250. Also the couple paid free Negro capitation taxes in 1860. Neither Thomas Alston nor his wife paid slave taxes for him. In short, many free blacks like Thomas Alston broke the barriers between slavery and freedom, thus establishing themselves as free persons.b

During the antebellum period, there were free black slaveholders who held the legal title to trusted friends and permitted them to work and live as free persons. In Charleston City, Elias Beard, a slave to the estate of Plowden Weston and a de facto free black, asked Samuel Weston to hold the title of his family. After Beard had saved enough money to purchase his loved ones, he requested that Weston be his agent and buy his family for him. On March 1, 1830, Samuel Weston

bought Rachel Beard and her two children, Georgianna and Martha, from Henry and Carolina Holmes for $700. Although Samuel Weston held the title to the loved ones of Elias Beard, he did not interfere in the life of the slave family. In fact, both Elias and Rachel Beard were reported to be free blacks and living on Queen Street in 1836. The nominal slave family had moved to Barnwell County by 1840. In the federal census of that year, Elias Beard was listed not only as a free black but as the owner of a young male slave. By 1850 Rachel Beard and her children had returned to Charleston City and established themselves as free persons with little interference from their nominal owner, Samuel Weston.'

In another example, Richard Holloway, a free black and a carpenter of Charleston City, permitted several of his slaves to have their freedom. For instance, Holloway assumed the obligation of holding Charles Benford so that the slave could enjoy the privileges of a free black. While Benford was the nominal slave of Holloway, he worked actively in the Methodist Church of Charleston City and proselytized to slaves as well as free blacks throughout the area. Although Benford was a slave, his status did not inhibit his quest for freedom; as the nominal slave of Richard Holloway, his liberties were protected. Yet his status as the property of another man made him subject to the debts of his nominal owner; thus he could be seized and sold for the unpaid bills of his holder. To ensure the freedom of the 52-year-old Charles Benford, his nominal master transferred the title of the slave to the Rev. William Caspers, Samuel J. Wagner, and Abel McKee in 1837." In the trust, Richard Holloway declared that

> If the said negro man should at anytime hereafter besiged under any legal process for the debt or debts of any or either of the above named, parties ... then and in such cases the interest and property of such one or more of the said parties ... shall cease and determine and he shall become wholly exclusively the property of the other party or parties ...9

When Richard Holloway transferred the title of Benford to the three gentlemen, he believed that they were more capable of protecting the freedom that he had given his nominal slave.

Charles Benford was not the only slave owned by Richard Holloway who was permitted to live as a free person of color. In 1833, Holloway purchased Maria Tunno and her two children named Joseph and Benjamin from Robert Bentham for $350. After the purchase, he probably allowed the colored woman to work for herself and

reimburse him for the money expended to buy her freedom. Once Tunno fulfilled her obligations, she was released from all claims to her by Richard Holloway. In 1845 the family of the deceased Richard Holloway declared that Maria Tunno and her offspring were freed from bondage and under no obligations to the Holloway family.10

Many other free blacks were committed to protecting the freedom of their nominal slaves. Yet the status of the nominal slaves was to be ultimately decided by the courts and the legislature.

During the late 1830s, the courts were determining the status of the nominal slaves in South Carolina. In 1833, two cases reached the Court of Appeal which dealt with the nominal slaves. In Thomas Linam vs. Samuel 0. Johnson, the court declared that when slaves were manumitted by their masters without a formal act of emancipation and exercised the privileges of free blacks, they could be seized as vacant property by free persons. The Act of 1800 was cited by the court to show how the slaveowners violated the law when they emancipated their slaves. According to the court decision, the emancipation of slaves was valid when a deed was duly recorded and accompanied by "the certificate of a magistrate and five free holders that the intended to be emancipated, is not of bad character and is capable of gaining a livelihood. And it is declared ... lawful for any person to seize and convert to his own use such slave so illegally emancipated and set free.""

However, in Elizabeth Cline vs. Daniel Caldwell, the court ruled that "a deed of a slave, absolute on its face, but with a secret trust, to let the negro go at large as a freeman, or with a view of future emancipation, is no violation of the act of 1820, and is obligatory between the parties: until emancipation actually takes place, the right of property remains in the grantee."" According to this decision of the court, as long as the owner of the nominal slave maintained the right of ownership, the slave could live and work as a free man and not violate the law which banned private manumission. In essence, the court declared that the slaves who received their freedom by deeds of trust could establish themselves as free persons provided that they had an owner, while the nominal slaves who were emancipated without a formal act of manumission could be seized (before such seizure occurred, however, they still enjoyed the privileges of free blacks).

In Monk vs. Jenkins, the nominal slaves who were illegally manumitted were entitled to exercise their freedom. Justice William Harper concluded that until seizure had been made, the slave must stand on the footing of free blacks. In other words, the nominal slave

could own property and live as a free person of color, but his or her freedom could not be guaranteed. If seizure occurred he or she would be forced into a more restrictive form of slavery. Since the slave had no owner to claim him or her, the slave would become the property of the individual that seized him or her as vacant property."

In 1841 the state legislature moved to end the controversy concerning nominal slaves. During the legislative session of that year, a bill was introduced in the assembly to restrict the liberties granted to nominal slaves. After viewing the merits of the proposed legislation, the assembly passed the bill, which declared that "every devise or bequest to a slave or slaves or to any person upon a trust or confidence, secret or expressed for the benefits of any slave or slaves shall be noll and void."" The statute not only declared that the trust to allow nominal slaves their freedom was illegal but stipulated that the slaves should be seized when the law was violated.

On several occasions the courts upheld the constitutionality of that statute. In Vose vs. Hannahan, the court ruled that "a deed of gift of slaves accompanied by a secret trust, that the slaves shall be held in nominal servitude only are declared void and no effect by the third section of the Act of 1841."'s As late as 1859 the courts continued to uphold the legislation against the trusts. In W.W. Belcher vs. Hugh McKelvey, the Court of Appeals ruled that "where a gift of slaves is made by the donor in contravention of the Act of 1841 against emancipation, the gift is void."16 However, in R.W. Broughton and others vs. Robert Telfer and E. Waterman, the court slightly modified the Act of 1841. The court declared that "a conveyance by deed prior to the Act of 1841 of slaves intrust to allow the slaves to be practically free is valid ..."" By and large, the legislation passed by the state assembly was a stopgap measure which affected only the nominal slaves who were freed after the Act of 1841. Yet hundreds of nominal slaves were living in the state as free persons of color before the statute became law and continued to exercise the privileges of free blacks after the passage of the bill.

Many of the nominal slaves not affected by the statute banning the trust lived in Charleston City. These nominal slaves continued to enjoy the liberties of free blacks. Lydia Weston, for example, was freed by her master, Plowden Weston, in 1826. The emancipation declared by her owner was not legally binding because the state legislature did not sanction the deed, as stipulated in the Act of 1820. She was therefore still the slave to the estate of Plowden Weston. But with that declaration of freedom, she conducted herself as a free woman. In 1830, she told the federal enumerator that she was a free woman of

color. Also the census taker for the 1840 enumeration listed her as a free person of color, and the city tax collector reported that she paid free Negro capitation taxes in 1846. Since Lydia Weston paid the taxes of free blacks, she accordingly acted as a duly emancipated slave and petitioned the city council for the permission to build a house on Inspection Street in 1852.' 8

Lydia Weston was so sure of her status as a de facto free black that she even owned slaves. In 1830, she was the owner of a young female slave who may have been her child. Ten years later, she acquired an elderly female slave, and shortly thereafter, she purchased a woman named Seraphine from her godmother, Seraphine Lacomb, for the nominal sum of one dollar. In spite of the fact that Lydia Weston was a slave, she enjoyed the rights of a free black and even owned slaves. The city officials of Charleston City clearly circumvented the statute of 1800 and passively allowed many slaves to act as free persons of color.19

For many nominal slaves the demaraction between slavery and freedom was a thin line. Although the de facto free blacks could be seized and subsequently reenslaved by any free person, they continued to interact as free persons of color. Since the number of free blacks was quite large in Charleston City and its surrounding areas, the nominal slave could easily blend into the free black community, finding safety in the masses. As they conducted themselves as free blacks and paid free Negro taxes, they brought little suspicion upon themselves.

As long as the de facto free blacks remained a subservient class, their privileges were usually assured. John Judah, the slave of Francis M. Weston, was granted his freedom by his master in 1831 and maintained his liberties for more than 30 years. In the deed of trust, his owner declared that "John Judah shall have his time and workout for his own profit in any place or places as any free person of color ..."20 With that declaration of freedom, John Judah assumed the privileges of a free black and maintained his freedom. In fact, so accepted was the status of John Judah that when Rev. Paul Trapier married him to Sarah Ann Logan, he referred to the couple as free blacks. Also the federal enumerator of the 1840 census reported that John Judah was not only a free black but the owner of two female slaves. By 1860 the 45-year-old John Judah was firmly established in the city as a free black. In that year, he operated a butcher shop and owned real estate appraised at $1,400 by the city officials. In short, the status of John Judah as a slave was not an important issue and so he kept his freedom with some ease.21

Occasionally the nominal slaves amassed a considerable amount of property. In 1835, the children of Philip Stanislas Noisette and his slave Celestine were declared to be free from bondage by their father. Within two decades after the declaration of emancipation, the daughter of Philip and Celestine Noisette was able to amass property valued at $28,000 in 1860.22 Although Margaret Noisette was a slave, she owned sixteen acres of farm land, valued at $8,000, and other real estate in the city of Charleston. She also owned 15 slaves who probably worked her farm. In addition, her son Alexander Noisette, who was a nominal slave, owned a personal estate which was appraised at $6,000.1;

Elsewhere in Charleston City, Anthony Weston, the nominal slave to the estate of Plowden Weston, amassed an estate valued at $40,075 and held 14 slaves. To ensure the safety of the estate, his wife, Maria Weston, held the title to much of his property.24

Many other defacto free blacks owned and sold property as though they had been legally emancipated. For instance, Hannah Gonzalez, the nominal slave of Henry Frost and Frederick Winthrop, purchased and sold slaves like a free person. On March 9, 1860, she purchased three slaves named Emma, Cuspid, and James from James F. Green and Alex Gordon, the executors of Basilio Gonzalez, for $500. Shortly after the purchase, she sold the boy Cuspid to John Marion for $125. Then Hannah Gonzalez sold her mulatto boy James to John Marion for $675 in September 1860. In spite of the fact that Hannah Gonzalez was a nominal slave, she owned property and even recorded legal bills of sale." According to Justice William Harper in Monk vs. Jenkins, the nominal slaves were entitled to own property just as a free black until someone seized them as chattel; then all the property acquired by the slaves would revert to the seizers. But until the seizure was made, the nominal slaves owned property and even sold slaves.

But the status of the nominal slaves was a precarious situation. Even though the defacto free blacks enjoyed the privileges of free colored persons, they were slaves and subject to be seized by free persons, the state, their owners, or the next of kin to their masters as vacant property. In 1831, for example, George Mathews declared:

> It is my Will that Somerset Cinda and her child Nelly John and Little Dye should be valued at a reasonable amount and be permitted to purchase their time and also that such a period be allowed them as my Executrix and Executor shall think liberal but should they or any of them not avail themselves of this privilege or not fulfill the terms granted to them to pay

> the amount. It is then my direction that they or any of them so acting be sold and the proceeds equally divided among all my grandchildren. 16

Upon the death of George Mathews, his slaves assumed the obligations of purchasing their freedom. In order to facilitate the purchase, the slaves were permitted to work for themselves and subsequently buy their freedom. In the meantime, they took the privileges of free colored persons. For example, Dye, the slave to the estate of George Mathews, assumed the rights of a free black while she attempted to fulfill her contract to the executors of George Mathews. During that time, she lived and worked as a free black. She eventually married a free colored butcher named Johnson and subsequently gave birth to a child named James. But while Dye Johnson interacted as a free woman, she apparently neglected to fulfill her obligations to the estate of George Mathews and failed to buy her freedom. According to the provisions of her contract, if Dye Johnson did not buy her freedom within a specified period of time, she would be sold.27

In conformity to the contract, Dye Johnson and her son were seized and placed in the Charleston Workhouse for an eventual sale by Simon Mathews, who was the grandson of George Mathews. To prevent the sale, Dye's husband asked his guardian, Thomas F. Purse, to intercede and stop the auction. In an advertisement placed in the Charleston Courier, Thomas F. Purse asserted that "Die Johnson ... and her child James ... are themselves free persons of color...."2' He also cautioned the public from purchasing the slaves from Simon Mathews or any other person. In fact, Purse even obtained an order preventing the Master of the Workhouse from delivering the slaves to anyone until the freedom of Dye Johnson had been established.

In a separate advertisement, Simon Mathews challenged the allegations made by Thomas F. Purse. Mathews declared that

> Die mentioned in the above advertisement was the slave of George Mathews deceased in his life time and is now the property of his Estate. The Subscriber as one of the parties interested in said Estate claim the right to sell her. Her pretence of freedom is without the least foundation.
>
> Simon Mathews29

The dilemma confronted by Dye Johnson was quite typical of the problems facing the nominal slaves. They could be seized not only by the heirs of their masters but by any person as vacant property. Yet a

few fortunate souls who befriended white citizens were protected by them. In practice, these whites served as their defacto guardians and defended their liberties.

In several instances, it became necessary for the nominal slaves to seek the aid of their owners. For example, Jerry Stevens, the nominal slave of his father, Lamb Stevens (a black planter of St. James & Goose Creek Parish in Charleston District), was purchased by his father from Dennis and Elizabeth Cain for $700 in 1831. Jerry Stevens, like many offspring held by free black parents, was permitted to live and work as a free person of color. With the permission of his father, he traveled to Orangeburg County and attempted to establish himself as a free black in 1833. But without any documents to prove his freedom, he was seized as a runaway slave and placed in the jail by the sheriff on May 6, 1833. Fearing that he would be auctioned as unclaimed property, he convinced the sheriff to place an advertisement in the Charleston Mercury to notify his father of his predicament.10 On May 28, 1833, the Charleston Mercury ran the following notice:

> Committed to the Gaol of Orangeburg this day a Negro Man of dark complexion 5 feet 10'/z inches high; calls his name Jerry, and says he belong to his father, a free Negro, living in Charleston by the named of Lamb Stevens; and that his father bought him from Dennis Cain. He also states that a Mr. Riggs living near Cypus is the Guardian of his father, Lamb Stevens.
>
> Wm. Murrow3'

Since the notice ran in the Charleston Mercury for several days, it is likely that colored friends or business associates living in Charleston City read the appeal and sent someone out to the Cherry Hill plantation, which was about 30 miles from the city, to inform Lamb Stevens that his son was in the Orangeburg County Jail. Upon hearing this news, he undoubtedly traveled to Orangeburg County and retrieved his son because the sheriff discontinued the notice place in the Mercury around the middle part of June. Furthermore, the sheriff did not place an advertisement in the newspapers for the sale of Jerry Stevens as unclaimed property.

As shown by the case of Jerry Stevens, slaveholders occasionally had to defend the freedom granted to their nominal slaves. Fortunately for Stevens and other nominal slaves, their owners and de facto guardians were able to protect their liberties.

The dilemma confronted by Jerry Stevens demonstrates the limitations that many nominal slaves had when they left the safety of their familiar environment. As long as the nominal slaves remained in their own towns and cities, there was a degree of security. But when they departed from their native soil and traveled to neighboring counties where there were few free blacks, they immediately drew the suspicions of the white residents and were requested to prove their freedom. Since the de facto free blacks seldom had certificates of freedom, they were seized as fugitive slaves and placed in the county jails. Unfortunately, the nominal slaves who were declared as fugitives were usually sold by the local sheriff as vacant property and forced into slavery.

In the relatively secure city of Charleston, there was the lurking sense of danger for many nominal slaves. Some were the descendants of female slaves whose owners died without transferring them to new owners, leaving them slaves without masters. Rather than find people to serve as their nominal owners, they conducted themselves as free blacks and paid the capitation taxes required of all duly emancipated slaves and their descendants. Yet they were still slaves, and the local authorities sought to force them into bondage. Many local officials were disturbed by the lost revenue from slave taxes and fees charged for hired-out slaves because the nominal slaves had no masters who could be assessed for the taxes. The lost revenue from the taxes as well as the increasing number of de facto free blacks prompted the city authorities to search for these nominal slaves and force them to take a master.

On several occasions, the city officials went from door to door searching for de facto free blacks. When the suspected parties were located, they had to prove their freedom or take a master. To complicate the ordeal, the testimony from free blacks to demonstrate that the accused was entitled to his or her freedom was not acceptable evidence. White witnesses were needed to prove the freedom of free blacks. In 1827, for example, the local officials of Charleston City demanded that Abigail Webley Beale, the daughter of Lydia Watson, prove her freedom. On April 18, 1827, she used the sworn statement of Eliza Allen to demonstrate that she was not a slave. According to Mrs. Eliza Allen, she was acquainted with the family of Abigail Webley Beale and the woman was the descendant of free parents born in the East Indies.32

Even though the search for de facto free blacks did not always produce a guilty party, the investigations continued. Throughout the antebellum era, allegedly free blacks who were believed to be nominal

slaves were challenged to prove their claims of freedom. In 1833, Nancy Harrison, the daughter of Mose and Ann Fairchild Brown, was asked to provide evidence to show that she was entitled to her freedom. Elsewhere in Charleston City, Louisa Shrewsberry used the sworn testimonies of Dr. Thomas G. Prioleau and Mrs. Murphy, a midwife, to prove that she was not a slave. In 1848, John L. Francis, a barber of Charleston City, was accused of being a slave by the local authorities. Without the testimony of Thomas Jones, the son of the former owner of the colored man's mother, he would have been forced to take a master. According to Thomas Jones, he knew John L. Francis to be the son of Hagar, who was purchased by his father and later sold to Steward Lamboll and manumitted in August 1797." Unfortunately, many members of the free black community were not as lucky as John L. Francis and were enslaved.

By the late 1850s and the early 1860s, the search for de facto free blacks began to intensify. As the emotions heightened during the secession crisis, the local authorities organized systematic searches to locate de facto free blacks and arrest them. In 1860, James D. Johnson, a free black and a tailor of Charleston City, stated that colored persons who for 30 years had paid capitation taxes as free coloreds were now forced "to go back to bondage and take out their Badges" like slaves.34 Johnson also reported that Joseph Dereef, a free colored, told him of "the case of a female whose Grandmother he knew to be Bonafide [free black] and knew her Mother also, when she had his child she came to him to identify her he being the only person that knew her origin that she could refer to and he could not relieve her."" Because Joseph Dereef was not white, he could not testify that the woman was a bonafide free person of color, and she was forced to take a master even though she was of free parentage. As the hysteria increased, between 300 and 500 badges were purchased within two or three days, mostly by "those who were under a mistaken notion that they were free and did not require it. "16

In the summer of 1860, many de facto free blacks were forced into slavery, permitting the city assessor to tax the owners when the slaves were hired out. In addition, many nominal slaveholders who allowed their slaves to work for themselves were fined when they did not pay the badge fees for their slaves. For example, Richard Dereef, a free colored, "had to pay some $80 fines for Servants without Badges" reported James D. Johnson." As the search for de facto free blacks intensified, more arrests were registered by the city authorities, forcing still more colored persons into slavery and increasing the collections from badge fees and slave taxes.

During the hysterical spring and summer of 1860, the city officials primarily prosecuted a particular segment of the black communityusually the de facto free blacks who no longer had nominal owners and those who could not provide sufficient proof to demonstrate their freedom. Among that segment of the black community, many were forced back into slavery, while others escaped bondage and fled to free states.

While many de facto and duly emancipated free blacks were being enslaved or leaving the city to escape the chains of bondage, there were several nominal slaves who were not prosecuted and continued to live and work as free coloreds. These de facto free blacks had nominal owners who allowed them to exercise the privileges of free coloreds as they paid the slave taxes and badge fees. In June 1860, when the city officials were looking for defacto free blacks, the Beard family, the nominal slaves of Samuel Weston, were reported to be free persons of color by the census taker. Also, the children of Rachel Beard paid the same capitation taxes that duly emancipated slaves and their descendants were required to pay. When the city tax collectors compiled the tax list of 1864, the son of Rachel Beard paid free Negro taxes while working as a laborer in the city. Although the status of the Beard family was still that of chattel, they continued to exercise the rights of free blacks."

Like Rachel Beard and her children, many other slave families continued to use the privileges of free coloreds even though the local officials were arresting hundreds of defacto free blacks. In June 1860, Ann Walker, the nominal slave of Edward North, was reported as a free mulatto and the owner of two slaves as well as an estate which was appraised at $4,000. Likewise, in July 1860, the census taker reported that the slave children of Philip Noisette owned property as free coloreds.39 Because many nominal slaves had owners and maintained their taxes while interacting as free coloreds, they could not be prosecuted like those slaves who had no masters. The nominal slaves, therefore, lived and worked in the shadow of slavery while they enjoyed the privileges of free blacks.

The hysteria of 1860 prompted many free blacks and nominal slaves to flee to the north. Yet before the panic of 1860, hundreds of nominal slaves in Charleston City were held by relatives and friends who allowed them to work and live as free persons of color.

Chapter Six

The Woodson Thesis: Fact or Fiction?

Many historians have argued that the majority of black masters purchased their relatives and friends who were held in bondages. Being unable to manumit their loved ones, the black masters were forced to hold their kinsfolk and friends as nominal slaves. So they treated their relatives and friends as free persons, and whenever possible, they attempted to manumit their loved ones. Thus the dominant pattern of slaveholding that developed among free blacks was benevolent and based primarily on kinship. The chief architect of the benevolent interpretation was Carter G. Woodson, and his thesis has been accepted by most historians.

Yet the Woodson thesis has many weaknesses that have been overlooked or not fully explored by its supporters. Furthermore, the Woodson thesis has been overemphasized, while the other side of free black slaveowning has been characterized as a minor facet by many scholars. However, there is ample evidence which demonstrates that free blacks purchased slaves as capital investments. To many black masters, slaves represented valued property being used to produce more wealth. These slaveowners, therefore, bought slaves as commercial assets and used them to make a profit. In fact, the commercial side of free black slaveholding was more prevalent than previously maintained by historians. In short, the Woodson thesis that most free black slaveowners were benevolent masters may be a myth.'

The benevolent interpretation postulated by Carter G. Woodson was based on data collected from the federal census of 1830. According to Woodson, the census provides ample proof of free Negroes owning family members. He declared (in 1924) that

> The census records show that the majority of Negro owners of slaves were such from the point of philanthropy. In many instances the husband purchased his wife or vice versa. The slaves belonging to such families were few compared with the large numbers found among the whites on well-developed plantations. Slaves of Negroes in some cases the children of a free father who had purchased his wife. If he did not thereafter emancipate the mother, as so many such husbands

> failed to do, his own children were born his slaves and were thus reported to the enumerators ... Benevolent Negroes often purchased slaves to make their lot easier by granting them their freedom for a nominal sum, or by permitting them to work it out on liberal terms ...2

In essence, Woodson's argument is centered upon three major points, all derived from the census of 1830. First, the majority of free blacks purchased relatives and friends who were slaves to white owners, and then allowed them a greater degree of freedom. Second, the small number of slaves held by black masters when compared to the large number of slaves owned by white planters suggests that free blacks purchased family members. Third, the census demonstrates these first two points, proving that free black slaveowners were benevolent or philanthropic.

Many scholars in the historical community have acquiesced to the Woodson thesis and have argued that most free black masters were benevolent slaveowners. In fact, John Hope Franklin reiterated the benevolent interpretation:

> The majority of Negro owners of slaves had some personal interest in their property. Frequently the husband purchased his wife or vice or versa; or the slaves were the children of a free father who had purchased his wife; or they were other relatives or friends who had been rescued from the worst features of the institution by some affluent free Negroes ... 3

The assertions of John Hope Franklin were quite typical among many prominent historians. Ira Berlin also accepted the benevolent interpretation, asserting that

> Although most free Negro slaveholders were truly benevolent despots, owning only their families and friends to prevent their enslavement or forcible deportation, a small minority of wealthy freemen exploited slaves for commercial purposes.4

Many historians like John Hope Franklin and Ira Berlin have accepted the Woodson thesis. Even at this writing, they continue to maintain that most black masters were benevolent slaveowners and held relatives to rescue them from the chains of slavery.5

Yet a small group of scholars has questioned the benevolent premises of Carter G. Woodson. In 1942, Luther P. Jackson reiterated the Woodson thesis that free black masters were primarily benevolent.

But he also asserted that after 1850, the institution became more commercial, with free blacks beginning to purchase more and more slaves as capital investments. According to Jackson, black entrepreneurs who purchased slaves to work in their businesses were prevalent in the 1850s. These black capitalists worked as barbers, carpenters, and farmers, as well as in other occupations which demanded laborers. Recognizing that slaves could be used to produce more wealth, these entrepreneurs utilized slaves as commercial assets and purchased them and sold them to make a profit.

The assertions of Luther P. Jackson slightly modified the Woodson thesis. Both hypotheses accepted the benevolent motives of black masters as the dominant force at one point in the development of black slaveholding; however, Jackson maintained that the commercial side of the institution was more prevalent after 1850.6

The observations of Jackson have been shared and even extended by other historians. In 1976, the benevolent premise was eloquently questioned by a graduate student at Johns Hopkins University. David Rankin said that

> Historians have traditionally assigned noble and generous motives to colored slaveholders. They have argued that the great majority of Negro masters owned relatives, and the New Orleans conveyance records provide ample evidence of fathers and mothers buying their offspring. They have argued that the small size of Negro slaveholding supports their picture of the paternal masters ... If many free coloreds bought slaves for their own good, others sold them for a profit. For example, On April 15, 1862, just ten days before Union forces captured New Orleans, a free woman of color sold a 25 year old female slave to Daniel Edwards ... Other free coloreds sold troublesome slaves or returned them to the original owner for cash.'

Rankin's observations concerning the commercial aspects of free black slaveowning were quite correct. Yet the commercial transactions of free blacks were also conducted by so-called benevolent slaveholders.

A careful examination of the three major premises stated by Carter G. Woodson casts suspicion upon the validity of the benevolent interpretation. For example, Woodson asserted that the majority of free blacks who owned slaves purchased only relatives and friends to allow them a greater degree of freedom, but he did not consider that many free persons of color bought slaves to be used as investments

even while they maintained and protected their slave families and friends. In Charleston Neck, James Brown, a free mulatto and a butcher, bought his wife Nancy, who later gave birth to their two sons, John and James Brown, while she was a slave. Since Brown could not manumit his family, he was forced to hold his loved ones as nominal slaves and give them their liberties. Yet James Brown also purchased slaves who were not related to him by kinship, but acquired as an investment for himself and his family. In 1821, for example, he bought a Negro boy named Joe from Levy Moses, the slave trader of Charleston City, for $250.' He later purchased from Moses a black woman named Juliet and her three children named Lucy, George, and Juliet for $800.9 Brown bought these slaves to assist him in the maintenance of his butcher shop as well as to provide domestic services for his family.

Since Brown owned two sets of slaves, he undoubtedly treated them differently. Even though his two slave sons were his property, he treated them as though they had been born free from slavery. But the slaves purchased for their labor were considered mere chattel to be bought and sold. A deed of trust established between James Brown and two colored friends demonstrates his interaction with his two sets of slaves. In the trust, he stated that

> In consideration of the natural love and affection which he the said James Brown hath for his two slaves John Brown and James Brown and for the purposes of making some provisions for them after his death and also of the sum of One dollar to him ... paid by the said John Weston and R.E. Dereef ... hath given and granted ... unto them ... the following Negro Slaves that is to say Joe aged about 10 years Juliet aged about 6 years Lucy aged about 9 years and George about 7 years ...
>
> In trust nevertheless for the sole use benefit and behalf of him the said James Brown ... after his death should his said sons John Brown and James Brown be alive ... to have and to hold the said Negro Slaves ...' 0

In the deed of trust, James Brown transferred the legal title to all of his slaves except Juliet, the mother of the slave children, to John Weston and Richard E. Dereef for the future benefit of his two slave sons. In the meantime, Juliet continued to serve the domestic needs of the colored family until the death of James Brown in 1842. In the inventory of the deceased man, Juliet was listed as an "old servant Negro woman" and valued at $50.00." The slaveownership of James

Brown, then, demonstrated a benevolent as well as a commercial exchange.

In many other instances, free blacks who purchased their families purchased other slaves for investment purposes to benefit their loved ones. In 1828, William Tardiff, a free mulatto and a boat builder of Charleston Neck, purchased his daughter, Katty, and her children, Hestor and Joe, from Benjamin F. Scott and J.D. Jenkins, executors of the estate of the deceased B. Reynolds, for $780. He also owned other slaves to utilize their labor. However, his interaction with his daughter was primarily a fatherdaughter relationship, while he treated his slave workers as chattel. In May 1835, he wrote:

> I leave my daughter Katty and her present and future issue and increase to the care and protection of the free portion of my family to hold them in the same manner as I have myself hitherto held her. It is further my will that if my other slaves shall desire to be sold or if the sale of them be deemed expedient for the good of my Estate my Executors shall have full power and authority to dispose of them to the best advantage ..."

In the early part of June 1835, William Tardiff died, leaving an estate valued at $4,678.79. Among the property that he owned were five slaves. His human chattel consisted of a male boat builder valued at $600, and a female slave named Betty and her three children, who were appraised at $1,000. Yet neither his daughter nor his grandchildren were listed in the inventory. Clearly, William Tardiff, as well as his executors, made a distinction between the enslaved relatives and the other slaves. In 1839, the daughter and grandchildren of William Tardiff were reported in the Free Negro Capitation Tax Book; however, they were listed as slaves. Undoubtedly the widow of William Tardiff considered her dependents free persons, but the city tax collector apparently knew that they were slaves."

When Carter G. Woodson asserted that free blacks purchased slave relatives and friends, he was quite correct. However, free blacks who held loved ones bought other slaves to be exploited for profit. To classify these transactions as benevolent would be a mistake. Even though these slaveowners usually demonstrated benevolent behavior towards their slave relations and friends, a commercial or materialistic exchange existed between them and their slaves purchased as investments. In fact, the free blacks who maintained a dual relationship with their slaves had no universal commitment against

slavery. To them, slavery was an oppressive institution when it affected a beloved relative or a trusted friend, but beyond that realm, slavery was viewed as a profit-making institution to be exploited.

In many instances, free black slaveowners shared a similar view of slavery with their white counterparts. Slaveowners of both races occasionally manumitted a trusted servant and in the same moment requested the sale of another slave. The act of freeing one or several slaves while others remained in bondage did not constitute a firm commitment against slavery, but a personal view which acknowledged that some slaves, through merit or hard work, deserved their freedom, while others were destined to be slaves until death. So when philanthropic free blacks purchased slaves and then emancipated them, they were not always paternalistic owners as Carter G. Woodson suggested.

For example, Richard Holloway, Sr., a free black of Charleston City, bought a slave named Charles Benford in order that the slave might enjoy his freedom. Yet at the same time, he owned other slaves who were not treated so kindly. In 1834, for instance, he purchased a Negro woman named Sarah and her two children, Annett and Edward, from Susan B. Robertson for $575. Within three years after the purchase, he apparently became dissatisfied with the slave family and sold them for $945. When Holloway sold the slave family, he made a profit of $370." Even though Richard Holloway, Sr., allowed a trusted servant to enjoy a greater degree of freedom, he was still a slaveowner for profit. So he sold and purchased slaves as an investment even while he held other slaves for benevolent reasons. To consider him a benevolent master would be erroneous because he also exploited other slaves for his own benefit.

Another example of the dual interaction between black masters and their slaves is the case of Rose Summers. In her will, she stated:

> I give and bequeath unto my Executor within named Two Children my Slaves one named John and the other an infant named Polly being the Children of my Slave named Bellah but on this express and positive conditions that he my said Executor will emancipate and set free the above named two children ...
>
> I desire as soon as it may be practicable that my Executor herein named will sell for money my four slaves to the best possible advantage together with all my household Furniture

..."

While Summers requested that the children of her trusted servant Bellah should be emancipated, her other slaves were doomed to the auction block. In December 1840, her executor sold the slave woman Elsey; then the slaves Sam and Henry were auctioned to the highest bidder for $970.13 in January 1841. Shortly after that date, the slave woman named Harriet was sold by the executor of Rose Summers for $300. After the sale of the Negro slaves and the furniture, the estate of Rose Summers netted $1,334.79, which was divided among five colored women designated as heirs by the deceased woman. 16

Clearly, Carter G. Woodson was partially correct when he said that "benevolent Negroes often purchased slaves to make their lot easier by granting them their freedom ...'" Yet these same Negroes also owned slaves who were purchased as laborers and used as investments. Even as they freed trusted servants, many black masters had no intentions of emancipating their other slaves, even when the masters died and could not benefit from their investments. So when Carter G. Woodson declared that "the majority of Negro owners of slaves were such from the point of view of philanthropy," he failed to consider that there were so-called benevolent masters who freed one slave and sold another slave for profit.'" Woodson's perceptions of free black slaveholding were partially correct; however, when the totality of the institution is examined, his assumptions are revealed to be erroneous.

Carter G. Woodson underestimated the materialistic side of black slaveholding when he said that the majority of free blacks owned slaves for benevolent reasons. Many black masters were firmly committed to chattel slavery and saw no reasons for manumitting their slaves. To those colored masters, slaves were merely property to be purchased, sold or exchanged. Their economic self-interest overrode whatever moral concerns or guilt they may have harbored about slavery. Since the black masters benefitted from slavery, they rationalized that because the institution was profitable, they could not relinquish their valuable property without being reimbursed. So black masters continued to own slaves even when the Union army was preparing to invade South Carolina in 1864.

Throughout the antebellum period in South Carolina, the materialistic side of black slaveholding was recorded in hundreds of individual documents. In the Office of the Secretary of State, free blacks registered numerous bills of sale which involved the purchasing of slaves. For example, January Hinds, a free black of Charleston City,

recorded the purchase of a Negro woman named Caty for 35 pounds sterling in 1800. A few years later, Mary Ann Smith, a colored woman of Charleston City, registered the purchase of a bricklayer named Stephen from Eliza Troup for $550.19 Although free blacks purchased relatives and friends who were slaves, others undoubtedly acquired slaves for commercial purposes. In 1833, Albert Smith purchased a black woman named Suzette for $305. Apparently, Smith became dissatisfied with the slave, and two years later, he sold the woman to Michael Custilione for $305. When black masters sold slaves at the market value, the transactions were usually far from being benevolent and implied commercial usage. In spite of Carter G. Woodson's assertions that black slaveholding was primarily benevolent and based on kinship, the sale of slaves was prevalent among free black masters. In Charleston City, for example, William Johnson, a free black and a carpenter, recorded the sale of a Negro boy named Ben. In 1781, the slave boy was sold to Conrad Keckely for 1,000 pounds sterling. Seven years later, James and Hannah Miles sold a Negro woman named Lucy to Richard Savage for 35 pounds sterling. And in 1801, the sale of the woman Charlotte was registered by John Martin Logan, who was a colored carpenter from Charleston City. 10 Surely the slave dealings of these black slaveowners were acts of commerce for monetary returns.

The commercial impulse of black masters to exploit the commodity of slave property was recorded not only by the Secretary of State but the Master of Equity in Charleston District. In scores of reports, the black masters appeared to have used their slaves as commodities. On June 2, 1838, for example, two colored women were involved in litigation over the ownership of a slave named Joe. In that year, Patience McKenzie filed a suit against Eliza Mackey. She claimed that her male slave was unlawfully seized by Eliza Mackey and placed in the city workhouse. As well as declaring ownerwhip of the slave, she maintained that the Negro man was her husband. Patience McKenzie asserted that Joe belonged to her because she had fulfilled the last financial payment to Eliza Mackey, who loaned her the money to purchase the slave in 1832. However, when she made her final payment, the colored creditor declared that the money was merely the wages for the labor of the slave. According to the testimony of Eliza Mackey, the slave was purchased by her and only hired out to Patience McKenzie.21 In sworn testimony, Eliza Mackey said that Joe was purchased by herself from William A. Carson in 1837. Shortly thereafter, she hired him to Patience McKenzie, who paid her wages for the labor of Joe until March 1838, when the colored hirer refused to pay the fee for using the slave. Then Mackey placed the slave in the workhouse and demanded that the master of the workhouse release

the slave only on her authority. Regardless of whether Patience McKenzie or Eliza Mackey owned the slave, the commercial impulses of Mackey are quite apparent.22

In a similar case, George Shrewsberry and James Hanscome, both colored slave masters, argued over the ownership of three slaves in the court of equity. Rather than sue each other, they filed a complaint against the master of the workhouse because he refused to release the slaves to either of the men until the ownership of the slaves was established. In 1845, the two colored slaveowners filed a suit against the master of the workhouse and claimed that he refused to release their property. In court testimony, it was established that George Shrewsberry acquired the slaves from James Hanscome through a gambling debt. However, James Hanscome refused to acknowledge the legitimacy of the debt and claimed the slaves as his property. Consequently, George Shrewsberry placed the slaves in the workhouse to prevent Hanscome from seizing the slaves. In the meantime, Shrewsberry petitioned the Court of Common Pleas of Charleston to determine the ownership of the slaves. Before the court rendered its decision, James Hanscome attempted to retrieve his alleged property, but the master of the workhouse refused to release the slaves to him or to George Shrewsberry until the ownership of the slaves was established.21 The commercial impulses of both colored men are vividly illustrated by the court proceedings. Such cases are not isolated incidents; in fact, they are prevalent in the court records.24

Indeed, many colored slave masters argued over the possession of their slaves, and even family members fought over the division of slave property. In 1848, Nelly Collins, the wife of Jonathan Collins, a free colored planter of St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, filed a suit against her daughter, Jeanette Collins. According to the bill of complaint, Nelly Collins alleged that without her consultation, Jeanette Collins had hurried to town after the death of Jonathan Collins and had qualified as executor of his estate, thereby receiving a warrant to appraise the estate on February 10, 1848. Sometime thereafter, a white man named John Myers, who lived with Jeanette Collins as her husband, threatened Nelly Collins and took possession of several slaves belonging to the estate of Jonathan Collins. Nelly Collins stated that John Myers had unlimited control over Jeanette Collins. The two of them made it difficult for Nelly Collins to enjoy the property of her deceased husband and she requested that the court protect it.

However, Jeanette Collins gave a much different account of the altercation. In sworn testimony, she declared that it was impossible to

occupy and cultivate the plantation with her mother, Nelly Collins. She also maintained that at the time of the litigation, her mother did not cultivate the plantation and allowed the "Negroes to be idle." According to Jeanette Collins, she frequently requested that her mother adopt some plan by which they could jointly manage the estate but Nelly Collins refused.

After much angry testimony, the two parties agreed to a partition of the estate. With the aid of Edward R. Laurens, the Master of Equity, it was agreed that Nelly Collins should have the exclusive right of occupying the plantation but that she must pay to Jeanette Collins the sum of $15 annually for rent. The following slaves were declared the exclusive property of Nelly Collins: John, Susanna, Murrow, Lander, Hope, Jemima, and Rebekiah. It was also agreed that Jeanette Collins would be given the following slaves: Louisa, Caesar, Harriet, Harry, Patience, Glasgow, and Mingo.2S Clearly, this sort of litigation filed by black masters over the possession and division of slave property was far from being benevolent and can be interpreted as a commercial transaction.

The commercial impulse of black slaveowners to use their human chattel as a commodity was recorded in numerous other types of documents. For example, there were mortgages registered by free blacks who used their slaves as collateral to secure loans. In 1811, Philis Wells, a free colored woman of Charleston City, used her servant Mark as collateral to obtain a loan from Peter Desportes for $900. In 1823, a slave named Sarah was used as security by William Aiken, a free black and a carpenter of Charleston City, when he applied for a loan from Joseph S. Brown for $600. Undoubtedly, there were black slaveowners who were confronted with financial difficulties and were forced to mortgage their slaves. In Charleston City, Sally, a free black woman, mortgaged her two children, Vensus and Jane. Apparently Sally needed the money and was ready to risk losing her children if she could not repay the loan borrowed from John Francis Chion.26 It appears that few black parents were as daring as Sally; most refused to mortgage their beloved children because they feared the consequences if default occurred. Yet the black masters who were not related to their slaves by ties of kinship were not personally disturbed when default and seizure occurred. In December 1841, John St. Mark, a barber of Charleston City, bought a Negro man named Billy and his wife, Provy, from Otto Cook for $420. Two years later, he obtained a loan from George Shrewsberry for $300. To secure the loan, he mortgaged Billy and Provy. Shortly thereafter, John St. Mark apparently defaulted on the loan and sold the slaves Billy and Provy for $375.27

In marriage settlements, black women occasionally conveyed their slaves and other possessions to third parties who would ensure the safety of their property from the debts of their husbands. In 1783, Hannah Norman, a free mulatto, sold to Margaret and Richard Singleton for ten pounds sterling the following slaves: Nancy, Mary, Judy, Lizzy, Nanny, Pindar, Billy, Peggy, Jeanny, Lucy, Isaac, Celia, and Hagar. However, the contract stipulated that Hannah Norman Miles would have the exclusive use of the slaves and that her slaves could not be seized for the financial debts of her husband, James Miles. In another example, Maria Chapman, a colored woman of Charleston City, transferred to Simon Magwood her slaves named Katy, Kates, Pompey, Peggy, and Fanny, as well as four lots of land on St. Phillips Street and five shares of stock in the Bank of the United States.2" Most of the black women who conveyed their slaves in the marriage settlements were not related to their slaves by kinship; thus their slaves were primarily viewed as commodity. For example, shortly after the marriage settlement of Hannah Norman Miles, she sold her servant woman Lucy, who was part of the chattel in her marriage contract, for 35 pounds sterling. When the bond of kinship has been eliminated from the slaveholding of free blacks, the commercial element becomes a strong motive. Consequently, the colored women who established marriage settlements viewed their slaves as investments to be utilized. In the marriage contract of Claudia Angelina Inglis, the daughter of a colored slaveowning barber from Charleston City, she held one-fifth interest in three slaves named Lindy, James, and George. And Elizabeth Susan Hanscome, the child of a white planter and his colored mistress from St. James & Goose Creek Parish, owned the rights to several slaves and a plantation appraised at $4,091.81.29 By and large, slaves conveyed in marriage contracts were seen as property by their colored owners.

The probate records also demonstrated the commercial motives of black slaveholding in South Carolina. In scores of wills, black slave masters used their human chattel as commercial assets, requesting that their slaves should be auctioned to the highest bidder for payment of their debts or for the benefit of family members. In 1820, Benjamin Lincoln, a free black and a tailor of Charleston City, instructed his executors to "sell my Negro Woman Slave Phillis and for the proceeds thereof to pay my just debts ..."10 In another example, Barbara Maria Bampfield, the daughter of Thomas Cole, a mulatto slaveowner and a bricklayer from Charlestown, stated:

> it is my desire that my servant Fatima be sold and that she shall have time to get an owner to her satisfaction and the

> money to be disposed of as before mentioned, that is after paying my funeral expences just debts and the said Fatima five dollars that the Balance be divided between Sarah Cole and Elizabeth Maria Jones Equally."

Shortly after the death of Barbara Maria Bampfield, her servant Fatima was sold by Jehu Jones, Jr., the executor of the deceased woman's estate, for $200 in 1832.

Not all of the black masters requested that their slaves should be sold. Other slaveowners bequeathed their servants to family members. Such transactions were usually made by colored masters to benefit their offspring or spouses. Maria Rose Derac, a colored emigrant from Santo Domingo, provided her adopted daughter, Mary Louisa Derac, with three slaves after her death. In 1834, Mary Gotton, a colored nurse of Charleston City, gave her daughter, Julia Mondaze, a Negro woman named Madaline. Then she presented her daughter with three slaves named Alex, John, and Ben upon her death.32

Many of the black masters who conveyed their slaves to relatives were commercial slaveowners who exploited the labor of slaves. Yet occasionally, when the colored masters received faithful service from their servants, they called for the manumission of their obedient slaves. In 1785, Abraham Jackson, an ex-slave from St. Paul's Parish, stipulated that "my Negro Woman by the name Sarah be immediately set free from all Servitude ..."'" However, Jackson did not emancipate the children of the slave woman, but requested that they be disposed of as "my Executor shall judge proper ...'114 Indeed, even as the colored masters were making their deathbed testaments, the commercial bond of slavery permeated their dying demands. To them, slavery remained an economic system to be exploited.

Other records collected by the probate court provide insight into the commercialism of black slaveholding. In the inventories sanctioned by the probate court, there were black slaveowners who possessed slaves upon their death and who were subsequently recorded by the probate judge. The executors of the colored masters who filed inventories primarily listed slaves who were not related to the deceased by ties of kinship. For example, Thomas Siah Bonneau and Joseph Humphries, the executors of Charlotte Kershaw, refused to list the slave relatives of the deceased woman in her inventory. However, they recorded her two servants named Jenny and Sibby, who were appraised at $400. Furthermore, the three slave relatives of Charlotte Kershaw were reported in the will and in the inventory of the testator as her legitimate heirs to receive not only money and

personal property but slaves. Clearly, the bond of kinship compelled the colored slaveholders to inform their executors that their loved ones were not chattel to be humilated and dehumanized by appraising them at the level of horses, cattle, and swine, narrowed to the impersonal medium of gold and silver. Yet the colored masters who were not related to their servants were not restrained from considering their slaves as chattel. Consequently, when the executors of the commercial masters filed their inventories, those slaves were appraised just like cattle and pigs. In 1860, the slaves of Philip Cohen, a colored farmer of Barnwell County, were appraised and auctioned like the livestock on the plantation of the colored man. 33 In another example, Peter B. Mathews, the executor of Julia Cox, was requested to appraise and sell the property of the deceased black woman, which consisted of a slave named Beck and household furniture. Elsewhere in Charleston City, Florian H. Long, the son and executor of Ann May, had four slaves belonging to his deceased mother appraised and subsequently divided among her children, Mary Long, Eliza Long, Florian H. Long, and Lydia Frost, in 1848. Like the slaves of white masters, the servants of black slaveowners were flung into the arena of contending heirs. Thus, the existence of family life among the slaves was occasionally upset by the death of the master. Mothers were sometimes separated from their children. In the case of Ann May, her 25-year-old servant named Matilda and the children of the slave woman were equally divided among the four heirs. Even though the offspring of Matilda may have lived in the same household, they were owned by different masters and subject to be sold and separated from each other.36

The commercial impulse of black slaveholding can be examined nowhere better than in Charleston City. In the port city, the environment was conducive to black slaveholding. The urban setting of Charleston provided many free blacks with the economic opportunity to prosper. Since the demands for skilled and semi-skilled workers were quite prevalent, the black entrepreneurs found an eager market for their services. Many free blacks were employed in jobs which were shunned by white workers. In fact, free blacks nearly monopolized such work as barbering, bricklaying, shoemaking, and tailoring. Once the black entrepreneurs were able to establish themselves and had developed a clientele, they began to prosper and eventually earned the capital needed to invest in slaves. So it was quite common for free black artisans to purchase slaves and use them in their businesses." In 1822, Moses Brown, a colored barber, purchased a Negro boy named Moses from Mary Warhaim for $300. Since Moses Brown was a barber, he instructed his slave in the art of

cutting hair. By 1823 the slave boy was working in his master's shop on 5 Tradd Street. Also in 1829, Camilla Johnson, a colored pastry cook, purchased a mulatto woman named Diana Todd (who was 18 years old) from Joseph and Ann Wilkie for $375. According to a Charleston socialite, Camilla Johnson used her mulatto servant to work at several of the parties she was hired to cater. As these black artisans began to prosper, they were able to utilize the services of slaves, and so they invested in human chattel and trained their servants in the skills of their trade to increase the profits of their businesses."

Once the black artisans trained their servants, the skilled slaves were a sought-after commodity, particularly among the planters of the neighboring parishes. So it was not unusual for black artisans to sell their talented slaves for a profit. In Charleston in 1818, George Miles sold his shoemaker named Jack to Simon Moses for $600." Elsewhere in the city, Hector Thompson, a colored butcher, sold a slave butcher for $375 in 1826. Eight years after that date, Thomas Small, Sr., a free black and a carpenter, sold his apprentice named Josiah to John Garden, a mustizoe planter of St. Paul's Parish, for $550. And in 1839, Joseph Williams sold a slave named Harry, who was trained as a millwright, to Maria Weston for $1,000.40. The urban center of Charleston was by far the mecca for slave transactions within the free black community in South Carolina.

Surely the monetary benefits of slavery stimulated free blacks to invest their earnings in that form of property. Yet their financial support of the peculiar institution created some problems.

As free blacks began to utilize the labor of slaves, the discontent of their servants became apparent. Although many slaves preferred the city to the plantation, they were still slaves and subject to the authority of their masters. Even the slaves who were held by kind colored owners yearned to be their own masters, entitled to all of the fruits of their labor. Furthermore, the paradox of black slaveholding increased the complexity of this form of bondage and caused a division between free blacks and slaves. In other words, the existence of black slaveowners weakened the structure of southern slavery, which was based on the rhetoric that involuntary servitude was the natural state of being for all people of African descent. How could a so-called inferior people accumulate scores of slaves and vast tracts of land but still be a subservient class? Yet if the black masters did not fit the model of inferior beings, then their slaves certainly were not inferior, because they were of the same heritage as their colored owners. This paradox of black slaveholding caused all types of

disciplinary problems. Consequently, the desire for freedom which existed in all slaves was heightened among the servants of black masters, precipitating discontent within the slave community and eventually manifesting itself in rebellious behavior by the slaves.

In many instances, free black masters saw the need to place advertisements in the local newspapers for the return of their runaway slaves. On August 20, 1836, Sarah Johnson, a colored seamstress, notified the public that her Negro woman had absconded from her residence. In the notice, she said that

> Servant Hestor went away on Tuesday morning. She is small stature a little pitted with small pox her front teeth much decayed had on when she went away a striped blue frock. It is suspected that she will try to go into the country ... I will pay any reasonable reward.
>
> No. 95 Wentworth Street
>
> Sarah Johnson"

Similarly, in 1859, Eliza McNellage placed a notice in the Charleston Mercury for the return of her rebellious slave. She stated that several weeks ago her black slave girl named Mary, who was about 16 years old, had run away. According to McNellage, the slave girl was "well known in the vicinity of Market and Archdale Streets."42 In order to apprehend her disobedient slave, she offered a reward of $20.

The black masters of Charleston City were not the only colored slaveowners confounded by the dilemma of troublesome slaves. In May 1840, Robert Collins, a colored planter of St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, notified the public that his Negro woman Tirah had fled from his plantation. Collins said the slave woman had absconded from his residence on April 6 and he would give to anyone "who will deliver her to me or in the Work House in Charleston" the sum of ten dollars." On March 9, 1849, a colored rice planter of Georgetown County made a similar request for the return of his runaway slave. Randal Harris said that the Negro man Beda had departed from his plantation and that the slave was carrying a gun with him. Randal Harris believed that Beda was going to the plantation of Andrew James Anderson, a colored planter of St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, where the wife of the slave man lived. In the advertisement, he described Beda as a male about 30 years old, standing 5 feet 6 inches tall. For the return of the slave, he offered a reward of $25."

Clearly, when black masters exploited their slaves for commercial purposes, they encountered the same problems which perplexed many white slaveowners. Regardless of the color of the slave masters, the oppressive nature of slavery was met with opposition from the slaves.

Many black masters were faced with the dilemma of controlling their slaves when they exploited the labor of their servants. The black masters believed that punishment was a necessary instrument to control their slaves and preserve a sense of authority. Like white slaveowners, the black masters placed disobedient slaves in the city jail or the workhouse and contemplated further punishment for their servants. In 1851, Elizabeth Collins Holloway, a colored woman, placed her servant Celia in the city jail after her slave had run away. In 1852, Holloway's servant Peggy was confined in the workhouse for disciplinary reasons. Such a confinement usually lasted from five to thirty days, depending upon the disposition of the slave masters. After the slaves were released from the workhouse, it was not unusual for their masters to give them a flogging for their disobedience. However, not all of the slaves were put in the workhouse for acts of resistance. Just before the sale of slaves, it occasionally became necessary to place slaves in the workhouse when they had a history of running away to ensure that they would not escape and avoid the auction. In many instances, urban slaves who realized that they would be sold into the country fled from their masters. In December 1856, Charlotte Carmand placed her servant Rebecca in the workhouse because she feared that the slave woman would be tempted to flee from the city when her servant discovered the proposed sale. After Mrs. Carmand sold the slave woman, she was released from the workhouse and placed in the hands of a new master. In general, the disciplinary actions of colored masters to control their slaves included confinement, flogging, and sale on the auction block.45

Many black masters sold their human chattel when they became dissatisfied with their conduct. Occasionally the colored slaveowners bought slaves only to sell them a few days later when it became apparent that their servants were troublesome. In 1818, March Dearington, a free black from Charleston City, purchased a slave woman named Phoebe and her child Martha from William Swift for $700. Apparently he became displeased with his slaves and quickly unloaded his investment. Less than one day after the sale, he sold the slave family to William Howie for $700. Elsewhere in Charleston City, Lucy Wilkinson purchased a slave woman named Peggy, then sold the woman less than five days later to Robert R. Gibbes for $80. In another case, Samuel D. Holloway took possession of a slave woman

named Ann from John Jackson when his associate could not repay the loan he gave Jackson to purchase the female slave. After Samuel D. Holloway claimed the slave as his property, he found the woman to be totally unproductive and so decided to place her in the hands of a slave broker to facilitate a sale. But the slave soon learned that she was to be sold and ran away from her colored master.46

Even though black masters were confounded by rebellious slaves, they were seldom deterred from buying slaves. In 1833, Juliet Eggart declared:

> I do authorize and empower my Executor in case the negro girl Celia above bequeathed should misbehave, so as to render it expedient for the interest of my children that she should be sold, that my said executor should sell and dispose of the said Negro girl Celia, provided that the proceeds arising from her sale be invested in other property for the use and benefit of my said children to be held for the same purposes as above declared in respect to said negro Celia ..."

Many black masters were ready to sell their rebellious slaves, but they were not willing totally to abstain from investing in human chattel. In many instances, they sold their disobedient slaves and purchased others who were subservient to their demands. For example, Elizabeth Collins Holloway sold her slave Bella when the woman refused to leave the country and move to the city. In the place of Bella, the colored woman purchased a slave named Dolly."

By and large, the commercial impulse of black masters to exploit their slaves was quite apparent in Charleston City. Many slaveowners of African descent used the labor of slaves for their own benefit. Yet the exploitation of slave labor was not always a smooth process because the slaves of black masters attempted to assert their own rights to freedom by resisting their owners. Thus, Carter G. Woodson's serene picture of black slaveholding does not totally portrait the realities of the institution.

In many instances, black slaveowners were no different from white slave masters. They both exploited the labor of slaves to extract a profit and used their slaves as commodities. In the early nineteenth century, Joseph Morton, a free black and a dray keeper, acquired seven slaves who were employed by him. According to the will and inventory of Joseph Morton, he used the slaves named James and Jack as dray drivers. And his slaves Betty and Hagar were washerwomen, who were hired out, while Sam and Jim worked as tailors in

Charleston City. Upon the death of Joseph Morton, he requested that Betty was to serve his wife for the term of two years and then be emancipated by his executors. He also declared that after the death of his wife, the slaves named Damon, Jack, and Sam should be emancipated. Even though Joseph Morton made provisions for the manumission of five slaves, he was still a slaveowner for profit and exploited his slaves during his life. Furthermore, he was aware of the benefits of slavery and how the institution could be of great services to the enterprising black artisan. So he gave his grandson, Joseph McKenzie Morton, the slave named Jim, and provided the services of Hagar to his granddaughter, Patience McKenzie Morton.49

Among the well-to-do colored families, the ownership of slaves was often passed from parent to child. Many colored families were aware of the financial benefits of slavery, and so they provided their children with slaves to further their ambitions. In 1835, Mrs. Barbara Barquet of Charleston City sold a Negro man named Peter (who was 20 years old) to her daughter Margaret C. Humphries for the nominal sum of one dollar. so Mrs. Barquet hoped that the male slave would be a great assistance to her son-in-law Joseph Pencil Humphries, who was a tailor. Prior to the nominal sale, Joseph and Margaret C. Humphries owned only three slaves, who were all under 10 years old and unable to be utilized as laborers by the colored couple. With the acquisition of the 20-year-old male slave, Joseph P. Humphries acquired a laborer to be employed in his tailor shop on 112 Queen Street. By 1840 the couple owned four laborers who were between 10 and 24 years olds'

Upon the death of Mrs. Barbara Barquet, she provided her other children with slaves. In her last will and testament, she wrote:

> I Barbara Barquet of Charleston ... declare my last will and testament as follows; I give and bequeath my servant Phebe to my daughter Carolina wife of John Francis Plumeau for her sole and separate use not subject to the debts or contracts of her present or any future husband. I give and bequeath my servant Johnny to my son Bissett Barquet. I give and bequeath my servant Carolina to my son Edward Barquet. I give and bequeath to each of my grand children the sum of $1,000. I give and bequeath my servants Henry, Becky, Bella and Manny to my daughter Carolina Plumeau. I give and bequeath my servants Isaac, Bella the younger and Diana to my children to be equally divided among them and I authorize my executors to sell them for the purpose of making a division when it become necessary ...S2

Mrs. Barbara Barquet, like many of the wealthy colored heads of families, regarded her slaves as mere property. For many, the moral issues of holding another person in bondage were overridden by the economic motive of profit. So when Mrs. Barquet ordered the sale of her slaves Diana, Bella, and Isaac, there was virtually no guilt associated with the request. On March 7, 1846, the three slaves were appraised at $1,300 and scheduled to be sold for the benefit of Mrs. Barquet's children. About five months later, the slaves were auctioned to the highest bidder for $1,350.40. As well as receiving the proceeds from the sale of the slaves, the offspring of Mrs. Barquet were provided with the wages of the three servants for the month of June, which amounted to $38. Before the death of Mrs. Barbara Barquet, her daughter Margaret C. Humphries was the only slaveowner among her children. After the division of the estate belonging to the deceased colored woman, all of her children were given slaves and subsequently became slave masters for profit."

Quite often the black slaveowners who received their slaves by descent were not benevolent masters, but owners of slaves for their own benefit. In 1834, Susan Ann Dereef, a colored woman of Charleston City, requested that after her death "my property be for the use and benefit of my mother during the time of her natural life and after her decease the said property shall be divided between my two sons William Edward and John Francis ..."1' Upon the death of Susan Ann Dereef, her estate consisted of four slaves named Tolimbo, Abraham, Sam, and Sarah, who were appraised at $560. In 1839 William Edward Dewees, the only surviving heir of Susan Ann Dereef, acquired the wages from the slaves named Sam and Sarah. In that year, Sam's wages amounted to $96, while the labor of Sarah produced $36. Between 1839 and 1841, the annual wages of the two slaves came to $132. As well as benefitting from the labor of slaves, William Dewees used his human chattel as collateral to secure a loan from his uncle Richard E. Dereef for $540 in 1843. Two years after the loan, Dewees decided to sell Samuel to Alexander H. Brown for $500. Shortly thereafter he sold a Negro woman named Harriett for $340.11

The commercial use of slaves by free blacks who acquired servants through descent was by no means a rare event. Furthermore, slaves were passed on, not only from black parents to their children, but also from black husbands or white lovers to their women. In 1798, Mathew Webb, a colored butcher from Charlestown, gave his wife, Elizabeth Webb, the use of his two servants named Sambo and Betty. However, he stipulated that after the death of his wife, the slaves were to be manumitted. In 1805, John Sheppard requested that his wife

take possession of the Negro woman named Coombe. Unlike Mathew Webb, he made no provisions for the emancipation of the servant woman. John Sheppard probably believed that his wife should have the authority to determine whether the slave woman ought to be freed.56

Occasionally white planters provided their colored mistresses with slaves as well as stocks and bonds. In 1821, Thomas Young Smith, a white planter of Charleston District, gave his colored companion, Ann Francis, the services of two slaves and the sum of $500." In another example, Thomas Hanscome, a white planter of St. James & Goose Creek Parish, bequeathed to Nancy Randall, a free black woman, the title to thirteen slaves named Bess, William, Boston, Robert, Simon, Henry, Flora, Black Dye, Abraham, George, John, Frost, and Phillis, as well as $15,000 in stocks and bonds. After the death of Thomas Hanscome, his colored mistress took possession of the property given to her in 1832. Shortly after Nancy Randall acquired her estate, she purchased a Negro man named Jacob from Edward H. Edward for $600. In 1835 she bought seven slaves-Becky, Dye, Bess, Jenny, Sam, Isaac, and George-for $1,820. The slaves acquired by Nancy Randall were used as hired-out laborers to urban dwellers as well as field hands on the plantation owned by her deceased lover. In 1841, Nancy Randall continued to use the services of slaves for her own benefit. In that year, she recorded a deed of gift to her grandson Joseph Hanscome DaCoster which provides added proof of the commercialism of her slaveholding.9e In the deed, she declared:

> I Nancy Randall for and inconsideration of the natural love and affection which I have and bear unto my Grandson Joseph Hanscome DaCoster have given and granted ... unto William P. DaCoster (the father of the said Joseph) twenty two shares in the State Bank -one note of James Hanscome dated 18 Oct. 1841 for five hundred and twenty five Dollars -one note of Thomas Hanscome dated 26 January 1842 for $525.00-one note of John G. Garden dated 7 May 1842 for $450.00-a negro man named Jacob and one negro woman named Hagar ... in trust to permit me the said Nancy to receive and enjoy the interest and income of the said Bank shares and notes and services, wages, and use of the said two negroes during the term of my natural life and after my death intrust ... for the use of my grandson ... 19

By 1844 Nancy Randall had begun to liquidate her slave property. In that year, she sold her slaves named Robert and Simon.

One year later, her slaves named George, Henry, Boston, William, Phillis, Bella, Frost, and Diana, as well as Diana's child, were auctioned to the highest bidder. In total, there were eleven slaves sold, and the sale netted $4,469.44. Like many colored masters, Nancy Randall was compelled by the urge for profit and did not even consider the possibility of freeing her slaves.60

The examples here used to illustrate the commercialism of black slaveholding represent only a fraction of the documents demonstrating the exploitation of slaves by black masters. Furthermore, the commercial side of black slaveholding was not a minor facet of the institution. To the contrary of the beliefs of many distinguished historians, the commercial aspects of black slaveholding are portrayed in numerous documents and represent the majority of the slave transactions recorded by the colored slaveowners.

Commercialism was apparently the prevailing trend even among the small black masters. For example, in 1830, the percentage of black slaveowners who owned less than ten slaves was 90.2 percent.61 Yet many of these small slaveowners were not benevolent masters, as Carter G. Woodson maintained, but slave masters for profit. In fact, Woodson's assertions that the small size of the slaveholding by black masters when compared to white planters proves that the colored masters were benevolent seems to be a feeble argument. For one thing, the slaveowners of the urban localities owned fewer slaves than their rural counterparts in South Carolina. Furthermore, the number of slaves held by free blacks does not always provide an accurate depiction of black slaveholding. Surely the black masters who owned one, two, three, four or even five slaves could have been using slaves in their businesses rather than holding relatives or friends.

In 1830, the federal enumerator reported that Richmond Kinlock owned two slaves. Among the slaves listed by the census taker was a 20-year-old black woman named Peggy, who was purchased by Sophia Jennerette Kinlock, the wife of Richmond Kinlock, for $300 in 1822. According to the Woodson thesis, Richmond Kinlock probably was a benevolent slaveowner because he held a small number of slaves. Yet that was not the case; in fact, he used Peggy as a domestic servant and occasionally hired the woman out. In his will, he wrote:

> It is my wish that the woman Peggy be hired out to pay all my lawful debts, but should my Creditors demand immediate payment then it is my wish and desire that Peggy shall be sold and after all my debts is paid the balance of sale shall go to purchase of a small girl which shall be the same to my

beloved wife if Peggy had not been sold as well as all issues from her ...6'

Clearly the whole argument that the small size of black slaveholding demonstrates benevolent behavior is overstated. The colored masters who owned one or two slaves were as commercial as the largest planters who acquired hundreds of slaves. Both slaveowners used their slaves as laborers and as property.

The example of the commercial slaveowning of Richmond Kinlock does not represent an isolated event. In many instances, small black slaveholders used their slaves to satisfy their own demands. According to the federal census of 1830, Lydia Watson was a colored slaveowner who owned three slaves, but she was by no means a benevolent slave master. In fact, Lydia Watson's slaves were recorded in her inventory as servants and were appraised at $650. Shortly before her death, she requested that her woman Lucy was to serve either her daughter or her niece as a slave. She also liquidated her human chattel when the market in slaves was profitable. In June 1827, she sold a woman named Ellinere and the child of the slave woman for $300. Then five months later, she parted with a carpenter named Isaac for $450.63

Elsewhere in Charleston City, Antoinette Langlois was reported in 1830 to be the owner of a female slave between 10 and 24 years old. However, the slave girl was not the child of Antoinette Langlois, but an investment which appreciated as the girl reached maturity. In 1827, she had purchased the child, Sylvanie, from her mother for $125. Seven years later, she sold Sylvanie to Leon Heckimath for $300. When Mrs. Langlois sold her slave, the value of the servant had appreciated by $175. Also in 1830, Martha Juliet Garden was reported to be the owner of two females. One slave was under 10 years old, while the other was between 24 and 36 years old. Eight years after the fifth census, she sold the now-36-year-old slave, Jane, to Joseph P. McCall for $450.64

The commercial use of slaves was prevalent not only among the small colored slaveholders, but also among prominent members of the free black community in Charleston City. Thomas Siah Bonneau, a mulatto and a school teacher, owned several slaves as well as a small plantation in St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish in 1830. Mr. Bonneau was one of the leading members of the Brown Fellowship Society from 1816 until his death in 1831. Even though he was a positive force in the free black community and educated many of the children from well-to-do colored families, he was still a slaveholder for profit and a

slave master of his own people. Between 1822 and 1830, he recorded eight bills of sale for the purchase of twelve slaves valued at $4,120. Between 1822 and 1830, he also sold two slaves for $620. On April 23, 1823, for example, he purchased a Negro girl named Betsey for $230. Later, after becoming displeased with the slave girl, he sold Betsey to Joseph Dereef, a free man of color, for $270. Mr. Bonneau not only discharged his troublesome slave within two weeks of the date of purchase but made a profit of $40.61

Thomas Siah Bonneau's exploitation of his slaves can be seen more clearly by examining his last will and testament.

> I Thomas S. Bonneau desire that soon after my decease instructions shall be given to have all my Stock and other things appertaining with the plantation itself sold and the money ... shall go to defray all expenses, and taxes ... however the said plantation cannot be sold at a fair price and it can be worked by hands now there viz Scipio, Abram, and Peggy so as to pay expense taxes and so forth in such case the same shall not be sold, [but] retained for the benefit of the family.66

In the will of Thomas Siah Bonneau, he also stipulated that his slaves Scipio, Fanny, and Mary should be "subservient to the wishes of my beloved wife ... and if the said two girls at anytime while serving prove obstreperous and wishes to be hired," he then demanded that the slave girls should be sold to a Kentucky slave trader.67 In spite of the fact that Mr. Bonneau was a prominent member of the colored community and perhaps a humane slave master, the freedom his slaves requested (to receive the wages for their labor) was looked upon with displeasure by the colored master.

Thomas Siah Bonneau was one of many colored men of stature who benefitted from the labor of slaves. According to the census of 1830 and the Brown Fellowship Society's List of Members, the following free mulattoes were slaveowners and members to the colored society: John Brown, Malcolm Brown, Moses Brown, Peter Brown, Thomas J. Cooper, William Cooper, James Harrison, John Harrison, Richard Holloway, Benjamin T. Huger, Joseph P. Humphries, Thomas Inglis, Jehu Jones Jr., Richmond Kinlock, John Lee, Charles Lemar, James Maxwell, John McBeth, William Mushington, and William W. Seymour. Many of the society's members were among the most talented and educated individuals within the colored community and highly respected by their class. Yet they were slave masters of their own race and used black men and black women

as merchandise to be purchased and sold for profit.6e

In spite of the fact that black masters used their slaves as commercial assets, many historians still have argued that free black slaveholding was primarily benevolent. Yet there has been no systematic attempt to prove their assertions. Even though scholars like Carter G. Woodson and John Hope Franklin maintained that the federal census provides ample proof that the majority of black slaveowners were benevolent and therefore purchased relatives or friends, their observations were erroneous in South Carolina. For instance, the census rolls suggest only that free blacks acquired slaves. The purpose of their slaveholding cannot be derived solely from the federal enumerations. But when the census is used as a tool to be cross-checked with state and local records, which often indicate the motives of the slaveowners, an accurate depiction of the institution can be ascertained. Since the majority of colored masters lived in Charleston City, and many of the documents recorded by free blacks were not destroyed during the turbulence of the Civil War, the port city provides the most suitable place to begin an examination of the motives of black slaveholders. In Charleston City, there were 260 slave masters who were reported to be of African descent by the census takers of 1830. However, only 200, or 76.9 percent, of the colored masters were recorded as free blacks or free mustizoes in the Free Negro Capitation Tax Book, the Charleston City Directories, and other state and local documents. The remaining 60, or 23.1 percent, of the alleged colored masters had no documents besides the federal census to indicate their race. Consequently, only the free black masters who were proven to be free blacks or free mustizoes by documents in addition to the federal census should be used to examine the motives of the black slaveholders and determine the percentage of commercial or benevolent masters.69

Before a quantitative study can be conducted, a definition of commercial and benevolent must be refined. Some conclusions can then be made concerning the dominant pattern of black slaveholding. The commercial element of black slaveholding is not difficult to determine. The commercial slaveowners used their slaves as commodities to be bartered, deeded, devised, pledged, seized, and auctioned. Commercial black masters sold slaves at or near the current market value. Some also willed their slaves to heirs and requested that other servants were to be auctioned to the highest bidder. Others used their slaves as collateral to secure loans, and they sometimes saw their servants confiscated and sold after default occurred. While it is true that the commercial slaveowners occasionally freed their trusted

slaves for faithful service rendered, the majority of the requests were deathbed manumissions which were prompted by guilt. As one Charleston editor noted, it was sheer hypocrisy for an "old sinner" who had "enjoyed the profits of the labor of his slaves, during his life time" to manumit them on his deathbed.70 Consequently, the free blacks who emancipated slaves while they held others in bondage should be categorized as commercial owners. In many instances, they purchased family members or friends who were treated as loved ones and bought other slaves to be used as laborers or as investments. In general, the commercial masters acquired slaves as commodities and used the labor of slaves for profit. For them, slavery was a livelihood, and whatever moral concern they may have had was overshadowed by the realism of economics.

The benevolent exchange between master and slave is more complicated than the commercial usage of slaves by free black masters. According to the Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, the term benevolent is defined as "marked by or suggestive of goodwill."" In the annals of American slavery, the slaveowners who treated their slaves with some tenderness were often referred to as benevolent masters by their bondsmen. For example, Charles Ball, an ex-slave, recalled that "my mistresses, in Maryland, were all good women; and the mistress of my wife, in whose kitchen I spent my Sundays and many of my nights, for several years, was a lady of most benevolent and kindly feelings."72

In order to determine the dominant pattern of black slaveholding, a working definition of benevolence must be established. Since the historians of black slaveholding have argued that the majority of black masters acquired relatives and friends, one facet of benevolent behavior should be the acquisition of kinsfolk and friends. The second facet should include the black masters who attempted or requested to emancipate their relatives and friends from the legal stigma of chattel. However, the slaveholders conforming to the first or the second criterion must pass a third test. They should not have acquired slaves as investments while their kin and friends were protected from the worst elements of slavery.

Surely the slaveowners who owned two sets of slaves were not firmly committed against slavery. They viewed the institution as a profitmaking enterprise, but their ties of kinship to some of their slaves did not permit them to treat their relatives or trusted friends as chattel. Yet the slaves purchased as investments were not related to their masters by kinship, nor were they trusted friends, and so they were viewed as commodities to be exploited for profit. In essence, the

truly benevolent colored masters acquired slaves for purely humanitarian reasons and sought no return, other than their initial investments that purchased the bondsmen or the taxes imposed on the nominal owners of slaves. Furthermore, the benevolent masters did not benefit from the labor of their nominal slaves, but allowed their slaves to assimilate into the free black community.

In Charleston City, 63 (31.5 percent) of the colored masters reported on the census of 1830 and acknowledged as free blacks or free mustizoes recorded documents regarding their slaveholding. Forty-one out of those 63 colored slaveowners registered documents which suggested that they used their slaves as commodities. Indeed, 65.1 percent of the black masters who recorded slave transactions were slaveowners for profit. These commercial masters sold, mortgaged, and used the labor of slaves for their own benefit. For example, Jane Brown, a free colored woman, sold a slave woman named Daphne for $500 in 1829. In that same year, the slave woman Charlotte and her child were sold by their colored owner, Joseph Barralli, for $850." The majority of the commercial transactions by free coloreds involved the auction or the private sale of slaves. Other commercial masters hired out their servants, devised them to relatives and friends, or requested the sale of slaves in their wills.

Many of the commercial slaveowners registered numerous slave exchanges and exploited slaves for profit even while they held others for humanitarian reasons. Consequently, only five black slaveholders in our sample were purely benevolent slave masters who acquired just relatives and friends. The purely benevolent masters represented only 7.9 percent of the black slaveholders who recorded their slave transactions. However, 17, or 26.9 percent, of the colored masters recorded on the fifth census as free blacks or free mustizoes registered bills of sale for slaves which did not specify the reason for purchasing the bondsmen. Furthermore, they did not record other documents which could have given added information on their slaveholding. In 1823, for example, Carlos Smith purchased a Negro woman named Catey and her four children, Mary, Margaret, Ann, and Charles, for $1,200. But the bill of sale does not indicate whether Carlos Smith was related to his slaves or acquired them as laborers."

For the most part, the documents recorded by free black masters were for commercial transactions. Even though the commercial masters represented only 15.7 percent of the black slaveowners reported on the fifth census, they made up 65.1 percent of the colored slaveholders who registered documents concerning their ownership of slaves. Surely the high representation of the commercial masters

indicates that the benevolent aspect of black slaveholding may not have been a dominant force in South Carolina. In 1859, for example, the Charleston City tax list reported that 108 free black persons owned slaves in the port city. Fifty-three, or 49 percent, of those colored masters recorded documents which provided additional proof of their ownership of slaves. Within that group, there were 36 free persons of color who registered documents which suggested that they used slaves as commercial assets. The colored masters who recorded commercial slave transactions represented 33.3 percent of the black or mustizoe slave masters reported on the 1859 tax list. Clearly, the dominant pattern of the commercial use of slaves recorded in these documents indicates that black slaveholding was primarily an institution based on the exploitation of slaves rather than a benevolent system centered upon kinship or humanitarianism."

Chapter Seven

White Rice, White Cotton, Brown Planters, Black Slaves

The commercial use of slaves occurred not only among the urban colored masters of Charleston City but also among their rural counterparts. To cultivate rice and cotton, the major staples in antebellum South Carolina, and to produce other crops on a commercial scale, free black planters needed laborers. Yet the only workers available to them in the numbers demanded for moderate- to large-scale production were slaves. By and large, free blacks who owned farms or plantations and sought to produce commercial crops tended to become slaveowners during the years from 1750 to 1860.

It was not until the seventeenth century that South Carolinians began to experiment with rice planting in the low country. In that period of time, rice was cultivated in inland swamps throughout the low country from Orangeburgh to Charleston District. By 1690, rice was established as a staple crop in the colony. In 1699, 330 tons (between 2,000 and 2,200 barrels of rice) were being exported. In 1720, there were 12,727 barrels of rice being transported to foreign countries. The early experiments with rice planting laid the foundation which established the crop as one of the major sources of revenue in South Carolina.'

As late as 1720, the production of tar and turpentine engaged more labor and revenue than the cultivation of rice. The conflict between Sweden and Russia, which started in 1699 and ended in 1721, caused a crisis in the London dockyards when Englishmen were excluded from the Baltic trade, and the flow of tar and pitch from that region fell off drastically. In 1705, Parliament passed an act to encourage the production of naval stores in America by offering bounties of four pounds sterling per ton on tar and pitch as well as three pounds sterling per ton on rosin and turpentine. The stimulus provided by the British propelled the American production to almost half of the tar and pitch used by England. South Carolina was one of the major producers of the commodity. In 1725, however, the English bounty was rescinded, and export figures dropped sharply. The loss of trade represented a loss of between one-fourth to one-third of the gross income of the colony.'

South Carolinians increased the production of rice in an attempt to fill the void left by the withdrawal of naval stores from the

economy. In 1730, the rice planters exported 48,155 barrels of rice. The rice culture continued to expand until the Revolutionary War, when production was sharply curtailed. As the war intensified, many planters found it difficult to cultivate their crops, and exports were reduced when British restrictions increased. After the war, however, the cultivation of rice gradually increased again, and by 1839 the Palmetto State produced 74.9 percent of the rice grown in America.'

The growth of rice cultivation was paralleled by the increased importation of African slaves during the colonial period. According to Peter H. Wood writing in 1974, the familiarity of the rice culture among African slaves attributed to the successful development of the staple in South Carolina. Wood suggests that Africans from the Windward Coast and the Senegambia region of West Africa (present day Gambia, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Sierra Leone and Senegal) cultivated rice plantations and small rice plots in that area. Since a number of Africans from the Windward Coast and the Senegambia region was accustomed to the rice culture, they applied their knowledge in the rice fields of South Carolina.' With a labor force accustomed to the cultivation of the crop, the planters were able to grow a large amount of rice.

Yet the geographical location of the rice plantation was as important to the growth of the staple as the use of African laborers. The ideal area for rice planting was in the coastal counties of South Carolina. Near the coast were swamps along freshwater streams. The swampland could be cleared by the tidal flows which pushed fresh water into and drained it out of the rice fields. In that region, the relationship between land, river, and ocean was of great importance because when the tides pushed fresh water into the rice fields, undesirable grass and weeds were killed, and the flowing waters flushed out the rubbish (rotten stubbles and roots of the plant) which accumulated in the fields. For many planters, the success of a harvest depended on the channeling of the tidal flows and the utilization of the marshes, swamps, and streams of the low country.'

The principle rivers along which rice planting occurred were the Waccamaw, the Pee Dee, the Santee, the Black, the Sampit, the Edisto, the Combahee, and the Cooper. Along the coast of South Carolina in the county of Georgetown ran Waccamaw, the Pee Dee, the Santee, the Black, and the Sampit rivers. These provided the rice planters with an abundance of fresh water. The Santee River separated Georgetown County from Charleston County. It flowed into three parishes in Charleston County: St. James Santee, St. John's Berkeley, and St. Stephens. The Cooper River also was located in Charleston County and

flowed within the boundaries of St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish as well as passing through the western part of the parish near St. James & Goose Creek. In Colleton County, the Edisto and the Combahee Rivers flowed in the western part of the county and emptied into the South Fork River in Barnwell County. And the Combahee River flowed in the southern part of Barnwell County and separated the county from Beaufort County. The abundance of fresh water supplied by the coastal rivers made Beaufort, Charleston, Colleton, and Georgetown counties the leading producers of rice in America during the nineteenth century.6

The colored masters who planted rice needed not only the flowing rivers, but the capital to invest in land and farming implements. In 1806, John Holman, Jr., an African slave trader from Sierra Leone, purchased a plantation on the Santee River in Georgetown County from George Parker for $15,000. In 1813, James Anderson, a colored slaveowner of St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, purchased a plantation called Bulls Head, which contained 541 acres of land, from Samuel Parker for $1,400. And in 1846, Margaret Harris, the daughter of a colored rice planter from Georgetown County, bought a rice plantation on the Santee River for $4,050. The colored masters who invested in rice land were primarily the offspring of wealthy white or colored slaveowners who provided them with the financial support to facilitate such investments. Often times, the colored planter received his or her land from relatives by purchase or descent. For example, Robert Collins, a colored planter of St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, sold a tract of land consisting of 130 acres, called Pleasant Hill, to his daughter Sarah Boag for the nominal sum of $25.'

Once the colored masters acquired their land, the next step was to purchase farming implements. On the well-managed rice plantation, the following equipment and livestock were essential: harrows, hoes, oxchains & yokes, oxcarts, plows, spades, and oxen. On the plantations of the wealthy colored planters, there were threshing machines and wind fans. When compared to the investments for land, the farming implements were quite inexpensive. In 1860, Robert Michael Collins, a mulatto rice planter of Georgetown County, invested in $100 worth of farming implements on a plantation valued at $10,000 and producing 90,000 pounds of rice. But clearly, rice planting was, as one scholar said, the occupation of the wealthy, and the amount of capital needed for rice planting limited the number of black masters who could afford to invest in the enterprise.'

The most costly investment made by the colored rice planters was the acquisition of slaves. In 1819, Elias Collins, a mulatto planter

of Georgetown County, purchased eight slaves from Anthony Chanet for $6,000. In 1847, John Garden, a free mustizoe planter from Colleton County, owned 62 slaves appraised at $17,352, while his rice plantation, called Hermitage and situated on the Pon Pon River, sold for $8,000. Elsewhere in the state, Margaret Harris of Georgetown County owned 44 slaves valued at $25,300, while her rice plantation on the North Santee River, called Santee, was appraised at $4,050 in 1860.9 The acquisition of slaves by colored planters was essential for the cultivation of their plantations. Consequently, their human chattel was not only their most expensive investment, but their most valuable asset because of the commercial value and the labor provided by their bondsmen.

Once the colored rice planters acquired land and slaves, they used their bondsmen in the same tasks as did white planters. In the fall or winter, their slaves started to prepare for the planting season by burning off the stubble of the preceding rice crop. The task of burning the stubble was usually assigned to female slaves, who dragged the fire with their hoes. When the wind shifted, they had to leap across the trenches to avoid the advancing fire. (The women tied their dresses to their knees to prevent the flames from catching their clothing.) When the smoldering stubble was consumed by the fire, the blackbirds descended upon the land and devoured the unsprouted grains of the prior crop. By February the slaves began the task of plowing and hoeing the fields. The tidal swamps were underlaid with muck or mud, and the rice seeds would not germinate in such an environment. The slaves had to turn the soil before the seeds could be planted. Using the power of oxen, they plowed the topsoil to a depth of two inches. After the field was plowed, the slaves set their hoes at an angle and chopped up the soil into an exceedingly fine substance. Upon the completion of the hoeing, the bondsmen still had other tasks to do. 10

In March, the slaves continued their preparations for the planting season by cleaning out the old trenches and digging deeper ones. Rice was planted in trenches four inches wide and eleven inches apart. It was sometimes necessary to clean out the trenches because mud accumulated in them. Both men and women scooped out the mud and scattered it on the edge of the trenches. Usually, the slaves had to dig deeper trenches when the hardened mud clogged up the passage and created a problem. About once a year, the male slaves were assigned to shovel out the mud from the trenches. By April the slaves normally had the trenches ready for planting."

Between April and May, the slaves began the planting season.

Usually women were used to sow the seeds by hand. They very carefully placed the seeds in the bottom of the trenches and then covered them with earth using their hoes. When the planting was completed, the slaves flooded the rice plot until the plant was ready to sprout. Then the rice field remained underwater for about two weeks or longer, depending upon the warmth of the season. The water was then drained off, and the plot was allowed to dry until the rice began to appear above the ground. Then the field received a second flooding to kill any weeds or grass which may have accumulated around the rice plants. After the second flooding, the plot remained underwater for about one week or longer, and then, for the next ten days, the water was gradually drawn off until the field was dry. During that time, the slaves began to hoe the field. They removed weeds and grass growing in the trenches and stirred the ground that became packed by the water. After the drying-out period elapsed, the land was flooded until the plant was ready for harvest."

In September or October, the harvest season began when the rice field was nearly dry. The slaves, with sickles in hand, started to cut the rice stalks, leaving the loose stalks on the stubble behind them. During the harvest season, it was not unusual for a prime slave to cut three or four rows of rice stalks at one time. In fact, the efficient field hand cut one-half of an acre of rice stalks in two hours. After the rice was cut, the slaves allowed it to dry in the sun for one or two days; then they bound the rice into sheaves to be carried to the stockyard. Generally the slaves transported the rice bundles on flats or rafts to the mill. But quite often, they carried the bundles on the top of their heads, as their ancestors had on the Windward Coast of West Africa, and placed them into carts to be transported to the mill for threshing. 1I

On the plantations of wealthy colored planters, there were mills equipped with threshing machines. These mills were situated on the edge of a river or a creek, so the slaves could navigate small flats or rafts containing rice to be threshed. The mills generally contained three buildings: a storage house for the rough rice which was hauled from the fields, a building containing the machinery used to thresh the rice, and a storage house where the milled rice was kept for shipment. The mechanical apparatus which threshed the rice was a remarkable machine and quite a timesaving device. According to Duncan Clinch Heyward, the threshing machine separated the husk from the white kernels of the grain. He recalled that

> bundles of rice ... were carried to the "beater," which threshed off the grains. Within the beater box, iron rakes moved the

straw to a chute through which it fell into the racks of wagons ...

As the grains of rice were threshed from the straw, they were passed through a fan on the first floor of the mill, and then in elevator cups were carried again to the second floor and run through a large screen. Again falling to the first floor, they ran through a market fan, after which elevator cups carried them back to the second floor and emptied them into wooden tubs, each usually holding fifty bushels."

In one day, the threshing machines on some plantations were capable of processing between 600 and 1,200 bushels of rice. Once the white kernel was separated from the husk, it streamed down from the cups of the apparatus into the waiting tubs held by slaves, who emptied the full containers into a chute in the rice house." Since the threshing machines were quite expensive, only the well-to-do planters could afford such luxuries.

Those small rice farmers who could not afford to own a threshing machine or chose not to send their rice to the mills employed other methods to process their rice. Usually female slaves cleaned the rice by putting it into a hollow wooden mortar, then beating the rice with a long wooden pestle which removed the husk from the kernel. After the husk was removed, the women whitened the rice with a flat tip attached to the pestle. When the process was completed, the rice was ready to be marketed.16

Once the rice was processed, the next step was to hire a factor to sell the crop. Most of the factors were situated in Charleston City, where they acted as the agents of the planters. As well as selling the staple crops, the factors provided credit and sold supplies to the planters. Several colored planters procured the services of the factors in order to devote their energies to managing their plantations. Also, the colored planters who produced large quantities of rice needed the specialized knowledge of their factors to receive the maximum price for their staple. Since their rice was sold in distant markets, they needed the factor to provide them with current information on the price of rice as well as the state of the market and to give them advice on when to sell their crop. When the rice was sold, the factor received a commission of 2.5 percent from the sale. In 1843, for example, the rice crop of Elias Collins was sold by his factor, William Mazyck, for $1,134.59."

On the plantations owned by colored rice planters, the life of the

slaves was not much different from the life of the slaves held by white planters. In either case, the slaves usually worked eight to ten hours per day in the rice fields. According to Robert Allston, once the slaves on rice plantations finished their daily work, they were allowed to have the balance of the day to be appropriated for their own purposes. Generally the diligent slaves had about two hours of sunlight when they finished their work early. The slaves were also given Sundays off, as well as the customary holidays of Christmas and New Year's Day. The practice of allowing the slaves free time was adhered to by the colored planters because the pressures from their bondsmen forced them to provide such leisure time. Otherwise, the discontent within the slave community would have reached the point of rebellion."

Although the black planters did not pay their slaves for duties rendered, they provided their slaves with sufficient food to sustain their workers. Most rice planters grew enough food to meet the needs of their slaves. According to the eighth federal census, the colored planters who grew more than 9,000 pounds of rice also cultivated between 100 and 400 bushels of Indian corn. And they harvested between 300 and 1,000 bushels of sweet potatoes. They also raised between 30 and 70 swine as well as owning cattle, milking cows, and sheep. These foodstuffs provided the principal diet of the slaves. In fact, the diet for one week was 3 pounds of pork, 11.25 pounds of rice, and 12.25 pounds of corn for a field hand. During the summer, the slaves were given a twice-weekly supply of beef. In addition to the allotment of beef, there was mutton and milk available for the slaves. The diet of the bondsmen was also augmented with fish caught in nearby streams and rivers. But occasionally the colored planters could not grow enough foodstuffs to feed their slaves and had to buy more food. In 1843, the plantation of one colored planter from Georgetown County did not produce a sufficient amount of corn to feed the slaves. To end the shortage, the agent of the colored planter bought 100 bushels of corn for $65."

When such shortages occurred, the wise planter was ready to purchase foodstuffs to ensure that his bondsmen would be adequately fed. Intelligent planters were aware that starving slaves were incapable of providing efficient labor, and so they attempted to supply a sufficient amount of food to keep their investments healthy and cultivating rice.

Another service provided by the colored planters was issuing clothes to their slaves. Usually they gave out clothing twice a year. For example, the slaves of Elias Collins, a colored planter from Georgetown County, were given summer and winter clothing as well

as shoes, which amounted to a cost of $305.25 during the year of 1843. When the allotment of clothing was handed out, the adult male slave received two pair of pants, two shirts, and one pair of shoes, while the female slave received two or three dresses, one handkerchief scarf, and one pair of shoes. Usually blankets were provided for each infant at birth, and the older children received a one piece-garment. Occasionally the wife of a planter who owned sheep utilized the wool from the animals and made homespun clothes for the slaves. Others simply purchased homespun cloth and required each slave family to make their own clothes. In 1860, for example, Margaret Peagler, the wife of a colored planter from St. Stephens Parish, bought 40 yards of homespun cloth for her slaves. After the purchase of the cloth, the female slaves began the task of making garments for the other slaves.20

Another service was provided by the colored masters when they furnished housing for their workers. Adequate shelter was essential if the health of the slaves was to be maintained. The typical slave house was about 18 by 22 feet. Usually the house consisted of a wooden frame covered with shingles and provided with a fireplace. On the Woodland Plantation owned by Joseph Hanscome, a colored planter of St. James & Goose Creek Parish, there were brick chimneys in the slave houses. Each house also contained a hall and two sleeping apartments which normally held five people. According to the eighth federal census, the colored rice planters accomodated four slaves per house." Yet the efforts made by the slaveowners of African descent to maintain a suitable life for their bondsmen was often negated by the hazards of the swamp.

Occasionally the rice planters of African descent were besieged by epidemics which decimated their slave communities. As Frederick Law Olmsted noticed, the slaves did not "enjoy as good health on rice plantations as elsewhere."22 The mortality rate was particularly high among the infant population. During the summer, the health hazard was so severe that Robert Allston, a rice planter of Georgetown County, said that he "would as soon stand fifty feet from the best Kentucky rifleman and be shot at by the hour, as to spend a night on my plantation in the summer."27 The observation made by Robert Allston was not an idle statement based on some mythical paranoia but a factual account of the dangers which confronted the occupants of his plantation. In just one year, for example, he lost 28 slaves, 22 of whom were prime workers. Many of the deceased slaves were the victims of cholera or malaria. The sickness of the swamps drew no distinction of color, striking the slaves of both white and colored

slaveowners. In 1843, Robert Collins, Jr., the mulatto nephew of Elias Collins, registered the death of slaves on the Santee Plantation in Georgetown County.24 In spite of adequate food, clothing, and shelter, the slaves on any rice plantation were occasionally faced with a life and death struggle for survival.

The colored slavemaster lived in paradise when compared to the lowly slave, but that life was limited to a very elite group. In the Palmetto State, there were only seven large rice planters of African descent, and they were primarily related by ties of kinship. The Pendarvis family was one of the largest slaveowning colored households to plant rice in the state. During the middle part of the 1730s, the mulatto children of Joseph Pendarvis, a white planter of Colleton County, and his African mistress Parthena, were given 1,009 acres of land near the Green Savanna as well as a plantation in Charleston Neck. The land that Joseph Pendarvis bequeathed to his children, James, Brand, William, John, Thomas, Mary, and Elizabeth, had been the property of his father, John Pendarvis. The children of Joseph Pendarvis received not only land from their father, but also slaves, becoming one of the prominent slaveholding families in South Carolina. 25

James Pendarvis, the oldest son of Joseph Pendarvis, received most of the property of his deceased father. Consequently, he was the only offspring of the white planter who owned more than 100 slaves. In 1786, for example, James Pendarvis owned 113 slaves, as well as 3,250 acres of land. In 1790 the federal enumerator reported that James Pendarvis was the owner of 123 slaves. Prior to his death in 1798, he owned 155 slaves, of which 134 bondsmen were adult field hands, while 21 slaves were children. Indeed, James Pendarvis was the largest acknowledged colored slaveholder in South Carolina. His slaveholding rivaled that of many colored planters who owned slaves in Louisiana and also surpassed white slaveowners in his native state.26

Since the executors of James Pendarvis did not record the amount of rice produced on his plantation called Beech Hill, an estimated account of his rice cultivation will be employed. According to David 0. Whitten, the yield per slave ranged from 2,025 to 3,600 pounds of rice in 1857. However, he also stated that the yield per slave had not greatly increased from the yield in the late eighteenth century. Using this information, a range of the amount of rice produced by the slaves of James Pendarvis can be established. Prior to his death, he owned 134 adult slaves. We may estimate the yield per slave as ranging from 2,025 to 3,600 pounds of rice. Multiplying the

number of field hands by the yield per slave, the bondsmen of James Pendarvis produced an estimated amount of rice ranging from 271,350 to 482,400 pounds.27 This estimate of rice cultivated by James Pendarvis ranks him among the largest rice planters in the state. By and large, James Pendarvis was an oddity, because few of the rice planters of acknowledged African descent reached that level of production or wealth.

Upon the death of James Pendarvis, he owned a vast estate which was appraised at 5,987 pounds sterling and 15 shillings. His estate consisted of two plantations, Leggs and Beech Hill, as well as tracts of land on the Horse Savanna and the Spoon Savanna in Colleton County which contained more than 3,000 acres of land. To complement his landholding, he owned 155 slaves. His livestock included 2 horses, 99 head of cattle, and 107 oxen. For his two working plantations, he owned one wind fan, which was used in the milling of rice and was appraised at 220 pounds sterling.21

Before the death of James Pendarvis, he requested that much of his estate should be given to his grandchildren. In his will, he gave the child of his son, William Pendarvis, Sr., the plantation named Beech Hill and the slaves who lived on the land. While the boy was a minor, the Beech Hill Plantation was to be worked by the slaves, and the money derived from the rice crop was to be put in the bank for the young boy. Also, the children of his daughter, Ann Perry, were provided with all of the lands at the Horse Savanna and the Spoon Savanna in Colleton County. When James Pendarvis provided his grandchildren with slaves and land, he also appointed William Eckells to serve as the administrator of his young heirs until they were capable of managing their own affairs. In 1800, Eckells administered an estate which contained at least two rice plantations and 156 slaves. By 1810 the heirs of James Pendarvis had reached the legal age to own property, but they had disappeared from the annals of history in South Carolina. In that year, no documents recorded the presence of his grandchildren in the state. Yet during the eighteenth century, James Pendarvis and his family were among the wealthiest residents of Colleton County.19

In 1785, William Pendarvis, Sr., the quadroon son of James Pendarvis and the grandson of the African woman named Parthena, was one of the elite colored planters. In that year, he owned 43 slaves. By 1786 his slave community consisted of 17 adult males, 17 adult females, and 10 children, together appraised at 1,493 pounds sterling. With the use of slave labor, he cultivated his plantation called Walnut and produced an estimated amount of rice between 68,850 and

122,400 pounds. By the summer of 1786, he became gravely ill and asked his father to manage the plantation in the event of his death. He also requested that the proceeds from Walnut Plantation should be given to his wife, Mary Pendarvis, for the benefit of his son, William Pendarvis, Jr.30

During the late 1700s, James Pendarvis and William Pendarvis, Sr., were part of the elite group of colored planters. They were the earliest planters of African descent and the largest slaveowners to be found in the state. Yet they were not the only colored men to use the labor of slaves in the planting of rice in South Carolina.

The Holman and the Collins families were members of the elite group of large slaveowners who planted rice. In fact, the two families were related by ties of kinship or marriage, and their origins can be traced to a white slave trader and his African mistress from Sierra Leone. Sometime between 1764 and 1768, John Holman left his homeland in England and sailed to the west coast of Africa. Upon reaching the shores of the continent, he began to establish himself as a slave trader and a merchant, engaging in commercial exchanges with South Carolina. Daniel McNeill, a sea captain from South Carolina, once stated that he first met John Holman in 1773 or 1774 and began to do business with him. On the Isle de Los, which was to the north of Sierra Leone, Daniel McNeill purchased 6,720 pounds of rice from John Holman.31

By the late 1780s, John Holman was firmly established as a slave trader. At his fortress on the Rio Pongo River, located to the north of Sierra Leone in modern day Guinea, he conducted a brisk trade with the indigenous people. He exchanged the supplies furnished by his factor for slaves and foodstuffs, which were eventually sold to the planters of South Carolina or to the slavers on the coast of West Africa.

Generally, the slave traders used the services of factors or middle men to sell their human cargo. These merchants of human chattel were situated in the ports of the major slave-using countries and negotiated a suitable price with the planters for the bondsmen. The proceeds from the sale were returned to the slave traders, minus the commission of the factor and other expenses. When John Holman disposed of his slaves, he too used a factor to sell them. In 1772, he requested that Henry Laurens, a merchant from Charlestown, South Carolina, should be his agent and sell 30 African slaves; but Laurens, being in England, could not comply with his wishes. So John Hopton, the assistant of Henry Laurens, placed the slaves in the hands of John

Lewis Gervais, who sold the slaves for 1,350 pounds sterling. Even though the demand for slaves was quite good, few planters wanted old or very young slaves who could not be used as workers. Consequently, Henry Laurens reminded Holman to "send none but young ones I don't mean Children. When a small parcel of old or ordinary Slaves come to hand, it is exceedingly difficult to dispose of them at any Rate.""

As well as trading in slaves, Holman supplied his factor with such delicacies as African deer and such luxuries as leopard skins. By 1784, John Holman was the second wealthiest man on the Rio Pongo, according to Daniel McNeill. In that year, Holman owned numerous slaves and a thriving business. In fact, the profits he made from the slave trade permitted him to extend his credit to John Lewis Gervais for 851 pounds sterling and 2 shillings in 1787."

As John Holman's wealth increased, he became extremely dissatisfied with his life in Africa. According to Daniel McNeill, once the slave trader had made enough money to live comfortably, he began to contemplate leaving Africa and settling in South Carolina. As early as 1770, he wrote to Henry Laurens and asked the Charlestown merchant to find him a plantation in Charleston District.14 Laurens replied that "five hundred pounds Sterling will secure you a Snug and improveable little Estate and twenty working hands, Men and Wives for the field, a Woman or two about the House."" Laurens suggested that Holman come to South Carolina and inspect the land before actually making a purchase.

Although John Holman wanted to leave Africa, it took more than fifteen years before he decided to settle in South Carolina. In 1787, Holman visited South Carolina and made arrangements to purchase a plantation. In that year, he bought a tract of land on the Cooper River in Charleston District which was called the Blessing Plantation from Archibald Brown for 2,500 pounds sterling. Shortly thereafter, he went to the custom house of Charlestown and informed the collector of his intentions to bring slaves into the state. While Holman was in the city, he wanted to be assured that he would not violate the law by bringing slaves into the state. During the 1780s, the state assembly had first prohibited the importation of slaves into the state, then later repealed the act. When Holman was informed by George Abbot Hall, the collector of the custom house, that he could freely bring slaves into the state and not violate the law, the slave trader departed for Africa and prepared to bring not only his slaves but his colored family.76

One of the reasons John Holman wanted to leave Africa was his

concern for the safety of his mulatto children. Sometime around 1765, he had taken an African woman called Elizabeth as his mistress, and the slave woman had given birth to five children named John, Samuel, Esther, Elizabeth, and Margaret. As the upheaval on the coast of West Africa began to intensify, Holman was concerned for the security of his children. In 1771, for example, the crews of several vessels as well as an English factor were killed by the Ballam of Sierra Leone. For more than ten years, no white man dared to enter the territory controlled by the Ballam. Surely John Holman was aware of the dangers of the slave trade and knew that as long as he continued the perilous commerce in human chattel, he risked the eventual collapse of his business and perhaps even his death. In fact, three years after he took his family from Rio Pongo and settled in Charleston District, the dangers of slaving struck the family of an old business associate. In 1793, the mulatto son of John Ormond was killed by the Bago while his slaves assisted in the burning and pillaging of the slave trader's establishment, which was valued at 30,000 pounds sterling. Ormond's father, an old English slave trader of the Isle de Los, died about a month after the disaster. Such upheavals were common on the coast of West Africa and caused John Holman to flee for the safety of himself and his mulatto family."

John Holman also knew that if the indigenous people of West Africa did not kill him, the movement to abolish the slave trade would be the death of his profitable business. In 1788, the Abolition Society of England waged its war of words against the trade. Within one year, it printed 26,526 reports and 51,432 books and pamphlets which strongly criticized the slave trade. As the petitions against the trade mounted, the British Crown appointed a special committee of the Privy Council to hold hearings on the trade. As a result of the agitation, the Parliament passed a law limiting the number of slaves carried on a vessel. Such weak legislation could not appease the movement against the slave trade. Yet it was not until the turn of the century that Parliament passed a law which suppressed the African slave trade. After May 1, 1807, no slave ship could be cleared from a British port, and no vessel could be used to import slaves into a British possession after March 1, 1808. In that year, the federal government of the United States also banned the importation of slaves into America. 3

John Holman attempted to maintain a suitable life for his family as the demise of the slave trade became apparent to him. While in Africa, his mulatto children were raised like free persons. For example, his oldest son, John Holman, Jr., was sent to Liverpool to be educated. The boy was quite fortunate to receive an education,

because few slave traders provided their mulatto offspring with schooling. In 1789, there were only 50 boys and girls studying in Liverpool, with others being taught in London and Bristol. Not all of those children were the offspring of slave traders. Some were the children of Africans who befriended the Europeans.79

With the education of the Europeans, John Holman, Jr., embarked upon his career as a slave trader. In 1784, when he was about 15 or 16 years old, his father employed him as an assistant in the slaving business. By the time the young mulatto slave trader was 20 years old, his father had provided him with sufficient goods to trade with other Africans for slaves. Within a few years, he acquired a store of goods and 13 slaves. His slave community consisted of seven males, named Davy, Little Belahly, Numah, Mohomadue, Old Calcutta, Sadue, and Salliah, as well as six females, named Carefah, Cumba, Cunney-gunney, Maria, Mah-canning, and Sarah-due. Once he acquired his slaves, he soon put them to work. His trusted slaves assisted him as slave traders and went down the Dambia River to barter for goods and slaves.40

The half-brother of John Holman, Jr., also was a slave trader. Indeed, William Holman provided Daniel McNeill with several slaves. While the half-brothers of William Holman departed for South Carolina, he remained on the continent and continued to deal in slaves. By 1796, William Holman had occupied the slave trading post at Bahia that was formerly controlled by the mulatto son of John Ormond. Within five years after the departure of his father to South Carolina, he became one of the major slave dealers on the Rio Pongo River. As the number of American slavers increased by unprecedent numbers during the late eighteenth century, the demand for slaves allowed Holman to reap the benefits from the market in human chattel. To William Holman and his half-brothers, the trade in Africans was a profit-making enterprise to be exploited. Yet the turmoil associated with the slave trade caused the death of many slavers and prompted the flight of William Holman's kinsfolk to pursue a safer investment in South Carolina."

The decision to leave Africa was not a difficult choice for John Holman, Sr., but it was a distressing situation for his African mistress and her children. Elizabeth Holman had family ties on the continent, and breaking such familial relationships must have been quite painful for her. Also, her sons, John and Samuel Holman, were prosperous slave traders and may have been hesitant about leaving their familiar surroundings and settling in a totally foreign environment. In spite of their misgivings about leaving their birth place, however, they

adhered to the wishes of their father and prepared to embark upon the journey to the New World.

In January 1790, John Holman, Sr., and his family boarded a vessel bound for Charlestown, South Carolina. About three months later, the slave trader and his family arrived at the port city. But to the utter surprise of Holman, he could not leave the ship with his slaves without the local authorities seizing his property for violating the statute which banned the importation of slaves into the state. Holman was forced to seek temporary lodging in Georgia, where he stayed for eight months, until his business associates in Charlestown successfully petitioned the General Assembly to allow him to settle in the state with his slaves.42

On January 12, 1791, the petition of John Holman, Sr., was presented to the House of Representatives of South Carolina by Colonel John Lewis Gervais. In the petition, Holman stated that when he visited Charlestown in 1787, he was under the impression that his slaves could be legally imported into the state. Upon his subsequent return to Charlestown in 1790, he found that the law which permitted the importation of slaves into the state had been repealed by the legislature in November 1788. Holman requested that the House should take his peculiar and very hard case into consideration and permit him to come with his slaves and settle in South Carolina. After the petition was presented to the House, the legislative body ordered that the request be referred to a special committee." On January 13, 1791, the committee reported that "having considered the facts alleged in the said Petition ... [we] are of opinion that it is for the Interest of the State to admit persons of property to become settlers ... therefore ... John Holman [should] be permitted to come with his negro slaves into this state ...""" On February 19, 1791, John Holman, Sr., was permitted to bring his slaves into South Carolina. After nearly one month of legislative delays, the petition of Holman was passed by the General Assembly.41

Sometime after the legislation was passed, Holman left his temporary residence in Georgia and brought his family and slaves into South Carolina to settle in the parish of St. Thomas & St. Dennis in Charleston District. In that parish, he used the labor of slaves to cultivate and harvest rice on his plantation called Blessing, which was situated on the Cooper River. Holman maintained his residence on the Blessing Plantation and grew rice until his death in July 1792.46 Shortly before his death, he recorded his last will and testament.

I John Holman lately a Resident in Africa but now of Saint

> Thomas's Parish ... do make and publish and declare this to be my last will and testament ... I give devise and bequeath one half part of all my Estate real and personal whatsoever to my eldest Son John Holman and his heirs ... I give devise and bequeath One Eighth part of all my said Estate real and personal whatsoever and whatever unto my Son Samuel Holman and his heirs ...
>
> I give devise and bequeath the remaining three eighth parts of all my said Estate real and personal whatsoever and wheresoever to Henry Lauren Junior Esquire and to my said Sons John and Samuel ... In trust to permit ... my three Daughters Hestor, Elizabeth, and Margaret Holman each to have use and enjoy one of the Eighth parts ...
>
> I do hereby Manumit liberate enfranchise and Set free my Women Slave Elizabeth the mother of the Said John and Samuel Holman and I do hereby charge and oblige my said Two Sons to maintain Support and protect her and to use her with Tenderness and Affection. I do hereby declare that I deem and consider and that all persons forever herein after Shall deem and consider not only my said Children John, Samuel, Esther, Elizabeth, and Margaret and their issue but also my Sons John Cameron and Richard and William Holman to be free to all intents ..."

In the will of John Holman, Sr., he emancipated his children in order that they might inherit his estate. Although Holman regarded his offspring as free persons, he had to declare their freedom because the legislation that allowed him to bring slaves into the state could be interpreted by his creditors to include his mulatto children, thereby excluding them from being considered legitimate heirs. Consequently, Holman reiterated that his offspring were free and declared them to be emancipated."

With the provisions of his will, John Holman, Sr., provided the economic base for the second largest slaveholding family of African descent to plant rice in South Carolina. When Holman died, he left an estate valued at 3,451 pounds sterling and 3 shillings. Among the possessions recorded in the inventory of the deceased man were 57 slaves. Most of the slaves reported were of African birth and retained their tribal names. In the inventory, the following Africans were listed: Addullah, Belkekly, Coreah, Cotte-de, Cumbah, Habbah, Mahmah-Toag, Newmah, Newmahoy, Sadue, Sarede, Yahle, Yah Morah, and

Yerebah. One of the female slaves was called Kisse, which was the name of a river in West Africa. Even though the estate of John Holman, Sr., was appraised in January 1793, it was not until May 1808 that a division of the slaves was decreed by the court. By that time, the estate consisted of 70 slaves. When the Court of Equity in Charleston District made its decree, John Holman, Jr., was allotted 37 slaves, while his brother, Samuel Holman, was granted 9 slaves and his sisters, Elizabeth, Esther, and Margaret, received the remaining slaves. Yet when the division was made, John Holman, Jr., already owned 20 slaves, while Samuel Holman held 42 slaves. Consequently, the allotment of slaves increased the slaveholding of John Holman to 57 slaves, and his brother's holding was increased to 51 persons. With the slaves provided by their father, both men were able to produce rice on a commercial scale.49

On March 24, 1794, John Holman, Jr., took the responsibility of managing the Blessing Plantation when Henry Laurens, Jr., relinquished the power of executor to the estate of John Holman, Sr. Laurens recalled that John Holman, Jr., was the most fit person to administer the estate, and he willingly surrendered his powers after two years of management. From March 1794 until January 1798, John Holman, Jr., used the slaves from the estate of his father as well as his own slaves to work the Blessing Plantation. With the aid of a gang of slaves, he cultivated a considerable amount of rice. When Holman managed the plantation of his deceased father, he utilized the labor of about 45 prime slaves, who cultivated an estimated amount of rice ranging from 91,125 to 162,000 pounds. The annual revenue from the rice plantation was between $3,508 and $6,237.10 But the Blessing Plantation on the Cooper River was not sufficient for the demands of John Holman, Jr., and he was prompted to move to more fertile soil.

In 1798, John Holman, Jr., disbanded his plantation in Charleston District and moved to Georgetown District. In that year, he rented a plantation situated on the Santee River from George Parker for 245 pounds sterling per year. During that period of time, using the slaves belonging to the estate of his father as well as his own slaves, he commenced to grow a large crop of rice. After renting the plantation for five years, he decided to purchase the tracts of land on the Santee River in August 1803. Since he did not have $15,000 in cash, which was the selling price of the plantation, he extended his payments over a span of three years and used his slaves as collateral. On August 16, 1804, he was to make the first payment on the plantation, which amounted to $10,000 plus interest. Two years later,

his final obligation for $5,000 and interest was demanded by George Parker."

In November 1803, John Holman, Jr., was preparing to leave for the coast of West Africa when he signed the contract to purchase the rice plantation. But before he departed for his homeland, he appointed George Parker to act as his attorney during his absence. While Holman was in Rio Pongo, his attorney managed the plantation and took the proceeds to be applied to the mortgage on the land.52

After Holman returned to South Carolina in January 1805, he relieved George Parker from the stewardship of rice plantation. But his residence on the Santee Plantation was merely temporary because he returned to Rio Pongo in West Africa in May 1805. However, he replaced George Parker and put his brother, Samuel Holman, in charge of the plantation. When John Holman returned to Africa, he was never again to set foot on the soil of South Carolina. Clearly, John Holman, Jr., was an extremely unusual colored man; he was not only a rice planter and a slaveowner, but an absentee owner who resided in Africa. s'

With the departure of John Holman, Jr., his brother managed the rice plantation. As the sole administrator, Samuel Holman directed the daily operations of a plantation which contained 128 slaves. In 1806, he utilized the labor of 79 field hands, who cultivated an estimated amount of rice ranging from 159,975 to 284,400 pounds. The proceeds from the rice crop were between $5,775.97 and $10,266.84.54

In 1807, Samuel Holman decided to visit his native land of Rio Pongo after more than one year of managing the plantation of his brother. Before his departure, he placed his factor, Anthony Chanet, in charge of the estate. As he was sailing to Africa, the principal creditor of his brother seized all of the property belonging to the colored planters. Apparently Samuel Holman had neglected to pay the debts owed by his brother, causing the seizure of their property. Since the debts were not owed by Samuel Holman, the confiscation of his property was illegal and prompted litigation against George Parker, who was the principal creditor of John Holman, Jr."

In 1807, Samuel Holman sued George Parker for the return and use of his slaves. After the litigation, the Court of Equity in Charleston District declared that Parker must release the slaves belonging to Samuel Holman. On March 16, 1807, Holman received 21 slaves from George Parker. Then three months later, Parker returned three more

servants who belonged to the colored planter. Clearly, George Parker was quite reluctant to release the slaves and procrastinated before returning the bondsmen to Holman. For instance, a second court order was needed to force him to relinquish eight more slaves owned by Holman. From the time Holman's slaves were seized, it took nearly ten years of litigation before all of his slaves were returned to him. The court also awarded him the sum of $2,790 for the use of his slaves by George Parker. By and large, the litigation of Samuel Holman was successful and he eventually reclaimed his property.56

However, the litigation of John Holman, Jr., was not so fortunate. In June 1810, the Court of Equity ruled that he was indebted to George Parker for the sum of $25,194. Consequently, the confiscation of his property was upheld by the court, but the property of the colored planter had to be liquidated and the proceeds from the sale given to his creditor. Also the court declared that only 37 of the 57 slaves could be auctioned for the debts owed to Parker. Shortly after the decree, the plantation of John Holman, Jr., was sold for $2,000. The sheriff then auctioned 37 slaves belonging to the colored planter for $11,730. When those sales were concluded, the sheriff auctioned property valued at $13,730. As a result of the court verdict, John Holman, Jr., was deprived of most of his property in the state, and thus ended the brief career of one of the largest colored planters in South Carolina."

In the society of the Southern planters, the demand for capital was a great concern. Occasionally, a planter was forced to borrow large sums of money to purchase slaves and land. Usually, the factors of Charleston provided the planters with the capital they needed for their plantations. Yet the whole process of borrowing money often placed them in serious debt and resulted in the seizure of their property. In fact, the financial demise of Samuel Holman was partially attributed to his dependence on borrowed capital. Holman was quite indebted to the merchants of Charlestown. In January 1806, he mortgaged 42 slaves to secure a loan from Frederick Tavel for $24,000. Under the conditions of the mortgage, he was required to pay $12,000 and interest on the loan by July 1, 1806. The final payment was due one year after the first installment was paid by Holman. But when the first payment was required, he apparently could not secure the capital without making a second mortgage on the same slaves used as collateral to obtain the loan from Frederick Tavel. In July 1807, his slaves were used as security for a loan from Anthony Chanet for $16,558.75. Apparently he used the money from Chanet to pay off the first installment of the loan from Tavel. Even with that payment, he was heavily indebted for the sum of $28,558.75. As his

financial problems mounted, he eventually lost his slaves because of the outstanding debts. On July 9, 1807, he lost 13 slaves seized under the mortgage of Frederick Tavel. Five years later, Lewis Chopein confiscated five slaves belonging to Samuel Holman because of an outstanding loan. By 1819, Samuel Holman was eliminated from the ranks of the large colored planters when a substantial portion of his estate was taken by creditors. In November 1819, the final chapter of his life in South Carolina was concluded when he left the state and went back to his homeland of Rio Pongo in West Africa.S"

When Samuel Holman arrived on the coast of Africa, his brother, John Holman, was a resident of Rio Pongo. The two brothers probably had only a brief reunion because there still remained some bitterness between them due to the mismanagement of the property of John Holman by his brother. In fact, John Holman was firmly convinced that he had lost his property in South Carolina because of the negligence of Samuel Holman. While in Africa, John Holman resumed his activities as a slave trader and once again prospered. Yet he did not forgive his brother for losing his slaves and plantation and refused to give him a significant portion of his estate acquired after the confiscation. In 1821, he wrote:

> I John Holman a Native of Africa but now resident of Rio pongas considering the uncertainity of human life ... do hereby make this my Last Will and Testament ... I request and ordain that my Executor shall pay or cause to be paid all my just debts out of my Estate or properties Whatsoever and also collect and receive whatever debts and sum or sums of money that may be owing to me or my Estate. After which I Further request bequeath devise and give unto my Brother Samuel Holman and all of my Sisters each the Sum of One Shilling and no more ... 19

Clearly, John Holman was dissatisfied with his brother and sisters, virtually disinheriting them. Consequently, the remainder of his estate was given to his wife and nephew. He requested that

> the whole and residue of my Estate Household goods and property of whatever nature whatsoever to be equally divided and given to my Well beloved Wife Sally and Well beloved Nephew Samuel Holman both of whom are Natives of Africa ... And I do hereby declare ratify and confirm that my Wife Sally is and has been liberated and made free from me and my heirs forever and that no persons have or can have any claim to her and further I do wish and direct that my aforesaid

Nephew Samuel Holman shall take care of my Wife Sally as his own Mother ... 60

Shortly after John Holman recorded his last will and testament, he died in his homeland of Rio Pongo in West Africa.

John and Samuel Holman were perhaps the only African slave traders who established themselves as slaveowning planters in North America. However, despite the demise of John and Samuel Holman as rice planters in South Carolina, that avenue of production did not cease for the colored family but continued until the Civil War. Elizabeth Collins, Esther Anderson, and Margaret Collins, the sisters of John and Samuel Holman, used their inheritance to assist them in cultivating rice. In 1808, each of the three sisters inherited nine slaves from the estate of their father. With the aid of their mulatto husbands, who were members of the Collins family, they were able to accumulate a modest estate. The husbands of the Holman sisters were born in the state and therefore had a better understanding of the region. They did not squander the property of their wives through mismanagement, but increased their wealth."

The marriage between the two families was not a union where only one group owned property, but a wedding of two property-owning classes. The Collins family owned a plantation in St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish of Charleston District. According to the will of Robert Collins, a white planter and the patriarch of the mulatto family, he bequeathed to Susanna Collins and her children, Nelly, Esther, Rachael, Charlotte, Rebecca, Gasham, Elias, Robert, and Jonathan Collins, all of his plantation, which contained 545 acres of land. Upon the death of their father, they shared the plantation as tenants in common and used slaves to work the land. For example, Robert Collins, the husband of Margaret Holman, used the slaves of his wife to till the soil of the plantation shared by his brothers and sisters. When James Anderson, the nephew of Robert Collins and the husband of Esther Holman, purchased a plantation in St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, he also utilized the slaves of his wife to grow rice in 1814. The marriage between the Holman and Collins families was ideal because it united a slaveholding class with a landholding class, thus providing the two key ingredients for rice planting.61

During the nineteenth century, there was only one line of the Collins family that dominated the rice culture among the colored planters. Elias Collins, the second son of Robert Collins, was one of the several colored planters who cultivated rice in Georgetown District. When he married Elizabeth Holman, the daughter of John Holman,

Sr., his wife brought nine slaves into the marriage and provided the collateral to secure the capital needed for rice planting. By his skillful use of his wife's slaves as collateral, Collins gradually acquired a large estate. In 1804, for example, he used the slave named Andrew as security to obtain a loan from James Cotton for $900. A decade later, he secured from Sarah Boone the sum of $1,200. In 1817, he mortgaged four slaves to Anthony Chanet for $2,800. Two years later, he borrowed from Chanet the sum of $4,800. With the capital from the loans, he was able to purchase slaves and land, thus increasing the output of his rice plantation. In 1819, for example, he purchased eight slaves from Anthony Chanet for $6,000. By 1820 he owned 34 slaves, of whom 25 were working in the rice fields. In that year, his slaves cultivated an estimated amount of rice ranging from 50,625.to 90,000 pounds. Within 20 years of his marriage to Elizabeth Holman, he had acquired a plantation which contained 821 acres of land and 34 slaves who cultivated rice by the thousands of pounds.63

Yet Elias Collins never reached the ranks of the large planters who owned more than 100 slaves in South Carolina. Between 1820 and 1840, his slave community grew by only 17.6 percent, or 6 slaves, and numbered 40 bondsmen.64 One of the reasons for the small rate of increase was the high mortality rate of rice plantations. Usually the infants had the highest death rate and contributed to the low rate of growth within the slave communities of the rice planters. In 1840, for example, Elias Collins owned only five slaves who were under ten years old, but he also held 20 females of childbearing age. When one compares the small number of children to the large number of childbearing females, the comparison suggests that more than five slaves under ten years old resided on the plantation, but they apparently fell victim to the diseases of the swamp and perished. For that reason, the slave population of Elias Collins did not grow by substantial margins after 1820.61

Although the slave community of Elias Collins was modest in size, he decided to purchase a second plantation. In 1842, he bought the Northhampton Plantation from William B. McDonald for $1,000. The plantation was situated in St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish of Charleston District and contained 3,500 acres of land. When Collins purchased the Northhampton Plantation, he was apparently planning to place a gang of slaves on the land and commence to work the soil. However, the untimely death of Elias Collins in the winter of 1842 disrupted his plans for expansion."

A few years before the death of Elias Collins, he recorded his last will and testament.

> I Elias Collins a free person of color of the Parish of Prince George Winyaw ... do hereby constitute and appoint Mess. Robert Hume and Jacob Cohen and my Nephew Robert Collins the son of my brother Robert Collins ... Executors of this my last Will and Testament. After payment of my just debts and charges I dispose of my Estate as follows I give and bequeath to my wife Elizabeth Collins all the negroes which belonged to her and which she brought me on our marriage together with the present and future issue and increase of the females ...
>
> All the ... remainder of my Estate both real and personal I give ... to my Executors ... In trust nevertheless to and for the following uses and upon the following conditions and limitations that is to say in trust that my said Executors will as soon as convient after my decease divide the whole of the said residue and remainder into four equal parts-one part whereof I give ... to my daughter Margaret Mitchell ... Another of the said part I give devise and bequeath to my son Robert Michael Collins ... the remaining parts and shares its my will that my said Executors shall keep and retain in trust for my two infant children Jonathan G. Collins and Elizabeth Collins ...61

When the will of Elias Collins was written, there was a provision in the document which could not be legally adhered to by his executors. For instance, the request to give one-half of his estate to Jonathan G. and Elizabeth Collins was not binding. Even though Elias Collins admitted that he was the father of Jonathan G. and Elizabeth Collins, they were excluded as legal heirs because of their status as slaves. Like many planters, Elias Collins could not avoid the temptations of slavery and sexually exploited a female servant while he was a married man. After his mistress gave birth to Jonathan G. and Elizabeth Collins, he attempted to protect his offspring from the worst features of slavery. In March 1839, he sold his mistress, Mary, and her children to Jacob Cohen, Robert Collins, and Robert Hume for the nominal sum of five dollars. Upon the transaction, he stipulated that the slaves should not be sold but given the privileges of free colored persons. The executors of Elias Collins adhered to the demands and permitted the slave family to enjoy the privileges of free coloreds. Yet when they petitioned the Court of Equity to divide the estate, the court declared that the slave children of Elias Collins were excluded as heirs and not entitled to the property of their father."

Once Jonathan G. and Elizabeth Collins were denied the property of their father, the court divided the estate between the free heirs. Since Margaret Mitchell was the only offspring of Elias Collins

conceived within the sanctions of matrimony, she was entitled to three-fourths of the estate. But Robert Michael Collins was born outside the boundaries of marriage and entitled to only one-fourth of the property belonging to his father, as stipulated by the Act of 1839. When the court divided the property of Elias Collins, it decreed that Margaret Mitchell was allotted the following 21 slaves: Jack, Lease, Homiday, Rachel, Little John, Sary, Mike, Mer- rideth, Jacob, Becky, Molly, Tenah, Judy, George, Sampson, William, Moses, Phillis, Joseph, Rachel, and Fudio. Robert Michael Collins was given seven slaves, named Glasgo, Sam, Carolina, Big John, Harry, Hannah, and Bob. While the slave property was divided between the two heirs, the real estate was sold to the high bidders and the proceeds given to the heirs. On April 16, 1846, James W. Gray, the Master of Equity, sold all of the real estate belonging to the estate of Elias Collins. The Northhampton Plantation was auctioned to Jonathan Lucas for $750. Shortly thereafter, Margaret Mitchell purchased Santee Plantation, formerly occupied by her father, for $4,050. After the two plantations were auctioned, Margaret Mitchell received three-fourths of the net proceeds while her half-brother was given the remaining one-fourth portion.69

By 1846, Margaret Mitchell Harris, the recent bride of Randal Harris, owned a modest estate. After the court decree, she held 37 bondsmen of which 21 slaves were inherited from the estate of her father while 16 slaves were inherited from the estate of her mother. In 1844, Elizabeth Holman Collins, the mother of Margaret Harris, had died without leaving a will. Without the instructions of a will, Margaret Harris applied to the probate judge for a letter of administration in order to settle the estate of her mother. After the letter was given to her, the colored woman paid the debts of her mother and claimed the residue of property, which consisted of 16 slaves and personal possessions, as the inheritance from her mother. Including the property from both of her parents, she owned not only 37 slaves but a rice plantation with 981 acres of land.70

With the two key ingredients of slaves and land, the colored woman was ready to plant rice. In 1849, Margaret Mitchell Harris and her half brother used their combined labor force and cultivated a large amount of rice. Using the labor of 37 field hands, they grew 240,000 pounds of rice, 150 bushels of sweet potatoes, and 100 bushels of Indian corn. Without the labor of slaves, the two colored planters could not have produced such a phenomenal quantity of rice and other agricultural goods."

Indeed, the large quantity of rice cultivated on Santee Plantation

can be attributed to the high productivity of the slaves. To measure the productivity of the slave workers, it is necessary to convert the labor force into the terms of a male worker or field hand. By comparing the working capacity of every slave, regardless of age or sex, with that of a field hand, the entire labor force can be reduced to its equivalent in field hands. For example, two female slaves between 10 and 14 years old are the equivalent of one field hand. Once the equivalent in field hands has been determined, the productivity per field hand can be founded by dividing the rice produced by the number of field hands. The slaves of Margaret Mitchell Harris and Robert Michael Collins were equivalent to about 26.66 field hands. Dividing the amount of rice produced-240,000 pounds-by 26.66, the result is 9,002.2 pounds of rice per hand. The productivity of the slaves belonging to the two colored planters was by far the highest in Georgetown County.72 In 1849, the slaves of Margaret Mitchell Harris and Robert Michael Collins were more productive than the slaves of Elias Doars, J.B. Easterling, Hugh Frasier, Robert Huggins, Robert Hume, or Eliza Pinckney.73

With the labor of slaves, Margaret Mitchell Harris and Robert Michael Collins extracted a modest profit from Santee Plantation. In fact, the proceeds of one complete harvest were nearly double the cost of purchasing the plantation. In 1844, Mrs. Harris bought Santee Plantation for $4,050, but the value of the harvest from 1849 was estimated at $7,632.

In order to determine the profitability of Santee Plantation, the rate of return from the total sum of money invested in the plantation must be calculated. Assuming that the plantation was purchased at the market value in 1849, the total amount of capital invested can be ascertained. In the census of 1850, the value of land, livestock, and farming implements was listed by the federal census taker at $5,045. Only the value of the slaves remains to be estimated. According to Ulrich Phillips, the prime slave from Charleston District during the year of 1849 was worth about $650. Yet the slaves on Santee Plantation were not all prime field hands; some were children and women. Thus the average value of the slaves in that community should have been about $450, or a total value of $22,050. With the estimates provided by the census and the value of the slaves determined, the total amount of capital invested in Santee Plantation comes to $27,095.7'

The second step in calculating the rate of return from the rice plantation is to obtain the amount of revenue made from the staple crop. In 1850, the census recorded the individual amount of rice

grown by the planters. According to the federal enumerator, Santee Plantation produced 240,000 pounds of rice during the year of 1849. Using the rice prices printed in the Charleston Courier, the annual average price can be calculated at .0318¢ per pound and multiplied by the amount of rice grown, which comes to a total revenue of $7,632.71

Table 7.1. Profits, Losses, and Returns for Santee Plantation in Georgetown County, South Carolina, 1849.

Investments	
49 slaves (average price $450)	$22,050.00
981 acres of land	4,050.00
Stock: cattle, horses, oxen, sheep, swine	895.00
Farm implements	100.00
Total	$27.095,00
Receipts	
Sale of rice (240,000 lbs. at .0318¢/lb	$ 7,632.00
Disbursements	
Support of 49 slaves: clothes, food, medical care	$ 1,148.62
Taxes: slaves ($1.50 per slave) & land (1% of value)	114.00
Charges on Rice: Commission to factor (2.5% of the gross revenue)	190.80
Milling (7.5% of the gross revenue of the rice crop)	572.40
Freight, Weighing, Storage, Insurance, & other charges (8% of the gross revenue of the rice)	610.56
Total	$ 2,636.38
Profits	$ 4,995.62
Rate of Return on the Capital Investment	18.43%

Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule 11, Georgetown County, South Carolina, pp. 1089, 1090; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 701-702; William W. Freehling, Prelude to Civil War: The Nullification Controversy in South Carolina, 1816-1836 (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), p. 362; Dale Evans Swan, `The Structure and Profitability of the Antebellum Rice Industry: 1859" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1972), pp. 57-80; David 0. Whitten, "Antebellum Sugar and Rice Plantations, Louisiana and South Carolina: A Profitability Study" (Ph.D. dissertation, Tulane University, 1970), pp. 106-110.

After the revenue has been entered, the third step is to estimate the expenses incurred on Santee Plantation. First of all, the support of the slaves should be calculated. Using the methods employed by Dale Evans Swan, which estimated the maintenance cost of slaves in regards to sex and age categories, the total cost for one year can be assessed at $1,148.62. Based on the studies of Alfred Conrad, Clement Eaton, John R. Meyers, Kenneth Stampp, and David 0. Whitten, other expenses can be estimated at $1,487.76, bringing the total cost for working the plantation to $2,636.38. When the difference between the gross sale ($7,632) and the expenses ($2,636.38) is calculated, the Santee Plantation is shown to have netted $4,995.62, or a rate of return of 18.43 percent, from the initial capital investment of $27,095.76

The rate of return on Santee Plantation surpassed the dividends from many profitable investments in Charleston City. In 1849, the interest rate on money deposited in the Charleston Bank or the Charleston Saving Institution varied from 5.5 to 6.5 percent; the return from Santee Plantation nearly tripled the interest rate of the two establishments. Also, the dividends from the Planters & Mechanic Bank or the Union Bank Stocks could not compare with the returns of Santee Plantation. Yet such fortunes could not be expected over a prolonged period of time because the planters were victims of the weather and the sickness within their slave communities. These two problems often caused small rice harvests, reducing the revenue made from the staple crop. As the profits dwindled, the planters were sometimes placed into severe debts when they overextended themselves."

In January 1860, Margaret Mitchell Harris decided to sell the majority of her slaves and discontinue the cultivation of rice, even though the Santee Plantation was profitable during her tenure. On January 7th, she sold 44 slaves to Thomas Ryan of Charleston City for $25,300. Apparently the 60-year-old mulatto woman grew weary of managing Santee Plantation and liquidated her chattel property.71 She invested the proceeds from the auction in stocks and bonds. Upon the sale of her slaves, Mrs. Margaret Mitchell Harris was the last colored rice planter who owned more than 40 slaves in South Carolina. However, Mrs. Harris was not the last colored planter to grow a large quantity of rice.

In 1859, Robert Michael Collins, the half-brother of Margaret Mitchell Harris, continued to plant rice in Georgetown District. With just 12 slave laborers, he planted 90,000 pounds of rice, 1,000 bushels of sweet potatoes and 100 bushels of Indian corn. The cultivation of

rice was by far the money-making staple on his plantation. In fact, the plantation of Robert Michael Collins made $3,591 from the sale of rice.79

Without a high level of productivity by the field hands of Robert Michael Collins, he could not have made such profits. During the fall harvest of 1859, his field hands averaged 9,836 pounds of rice. When Collins extracted the maximum amount of labor from his slaves, he assured himself of a reasonable profit. At the end of 1859, he made a net profit of $1,969.73. Yet the rate of return from the capital invested in the rice plantation at the market value of 1859 was only 7.05 percent. Even though the return was not as large as the rate made by Robert Michael Collins and his half-sister in 1849, it was greater than that of other investments. In 1859, the return from the plantation of Robert Michael Collins exceeded the dividends from the Planters & Mechanic Bank Stock by .04 percent, it surpassed the interest rate of the Charleston Saving Institution by 2.05 percent. By and large, the colored planters extracted a profit from rice planting, but the financial rewards would not have been obtained without the use of slave labor.e°

Table 7.2. Profits, Losses, and Returns for Robert Michael Collins' Plantation in Georgetown County, South Carolina, 1859.

Investments	
17 slaves (average price $1008.47)	$17,144.00
3,900 acres of land	10,000.00
Livestock: cattle, horses, oxen, sheep, swine	700.00
Farm implements	100.00
Total	$27,944.00
Receipts	
Sale of rice (90,000 lbs. at .0399¢/lb	$ 3,591.00
Disbursements	
Support of 17 slaves: clothes, food, medical care	$ 777.39
Taxes: slaves ($2.50 per slave) & land (I.5% of value)	192.50
Charges on Rice: Commission to factor (2.5% of sale)	89.78
Milling (7.5% of gross return on the rice crop)	269.32
Freight, Weighing, Storage, Insurance & other charges	292.28
Total	$ 1,621.27
Profits	$ 1,969.73
Rate of Return on the Capital Investment	7.05%

Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule II, Georgetown County, South Carolina, p. 134; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 13-14; Dale Evans Swan, "The Structure and Profitability of the Antebellum Rice Industry 1859" (Ph.d. dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1972), pp. 57-80.

The benefits derived from slavery and rice planting were not utilized only by Robert Michael Collins, but also by his relatives from Charleston District. In 1850, Andrew James Anderson, the cousin of Robert Michael Collins and Margaret Mitchell Harris, owned twelve slaves and a rice plantation called Bulls Head in St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish. Anderson received the majority of his property by descent. Between 1818 and 1828, he was given slaves by his grandmother, Esther McIntoish, and his mother, Esther Holman Anderson, while his father, James Anderson, left him the Bulls Head Plantation after the death of his mother. With both slaves and land, he planted 24,000 pounds of rice, 500 bushels of sweet potatoes, and 100 bushels of Indian corn in 1849. During the late fall of 1849, he sold his rice crop for about $763.20.81

As long as rice planting was profitable, the colored planters would not divest themselves of their slaves or land. Indeed, several colored planters like Andrew James Anderson used the labor of slaves to cultivate their plantations as late as 1860. Sarah Collins Boag, the cousin of Andrew James Anderson and Robert Michael Collins, employed the labor of her slaves in the planting of rice until the Civil War. In 1860, she owned ten slaves and 270 acres of land called Pleasant Hill. On her small tract of land, she produced 6,000 pounds of rice, 200 bushels of sweet potatoes, and 150 bushels of Indian corn. Without the labor of slaves, Sarah Boag could not have tilled the soil of her farm.82

Sarah Boag, like her cousin, received her slaves and land by descent. In 1842, Sarah Collins Boag as well as her brother, Robert Collins, and her two sisters, Martha and Charlotte Collins, were given the means to plant rice. On March 24, Robert Collins, Sr., transferred the slaves named Bella, Charles, John, Hannah, David, Isreal, Pino, and Dick to his children for $100.83 Although he transferred eight slaves to his offspring, the bondsmen were not his property. His wife, Margaret Holman Collins, had requested in her will that "my earthly property consisting of Negroes names as follows Charles, John, Beller, Mensee, Hanna and her three children I give and bequeath unto my Dear Husband Robert Collins ... And at his death the negroes be equally divided to my children ..."86 The slaves acquired by Margaret

Holman Collins were part of her inheritance from the estate of her deceased father, John Holman, Sr. She, in turn, passed the slaves on to her children. Sarah Collins Boag inherited the slaves named Pino and Dick. She also inherited a slave named Peggy from her aunt, Charlotte Boone, in 1837.85

In addition to the slaves, Sarah Boag acquired the tract of land called Pleasant Hill, which contained 130 acres of land, from her father in 1842. Her brother and sisters were provided with the farm called Hickory Hill. While the children of Robert and Margaret Holman Collins were provided with slaves and land, only one of their offspring used the inheritance to plant rice .36

When Sarah Collins Boag harvested her rice crop, she could not depend upon the plant as a major cash crop. In 1859, her crop of rice was valued at only $239.40. Yet the market value of 150 bushels of corn, 200 bushels of sweet potatoes, and 6,720 pounds of hay was estimated at $333.32. Many of the small rice planters could not cultivate a sufficient amount of rice to make their farms profitable, so other crops were grown on a commercial scale and sold to the large- and medium-sized planters who could not grow enough foodstuffs to feed their slaves.87 In fact, over 60% of the revenue made from the rice farm was based on grain and meat production. On the whole, the small colored planters benefitted from the deficiencies which occurred on the large plantations and produced more than one crop on a commercial scale.

Among the colored slaveowners who planted both large and small quantities of rice, the ties of kinship were quite prevalent. The colored planter families already examined had another planter relative, Jonathan Collins of St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish. He was the uncle of Margaret Mitchell Harris, Robert Michael Collins, and Sarah Collins Boag as well as the great uncle of Andrew James Anderson. In 1840, Jonathan Collins planted a small crop of rice. Using his labor force of four adult slaves, he cultivated an estimated amount of rice which ranged between 8,200 and 14,400 pounds. For the next eight years, he used his slaves to grow rice. On February 10, 1848, his rice production ceased after a prolonged illness caused his death. One month before his death, he recorded his last will and testament.ee

> I Johnathan Collins of St. Thomas Parish being weak in body but of sound mind and memory praised be God for the same do make this my last will and testament in manner ... I give

> devise and bequeath equally unto my wife Nelly Collins and unto my daughter Jennet all my estate real and property during their lives ...19

When Jonathan Collins died, he owned sixteen slaves-Glasgow, Hannah, Louisa, Rebecca, Caesar, Harriet, Florry, Patience, Glasgow (sic), Susannah, John, Morrow, Lauder, Hope, Jemina, and Mingo-who were appraised at $5,525. It was not until the winter of 1848 that the estate was appraised, and it was still longer before the property was divided among the two heirs.

With the aid of the Charleston Court of Equity, the property of the deceased Jonathan Collins was divided between his two heirs. On June 21, 1849, Edward R. Laurens, the Master of Equity, ruled that Nelly Collins was entitled to seven slaves -John, Susannah, Morrow, Lauder, Hope, Jemina, and Rebecca. Jennette Collins, the daughter of Nelly Collins, was also awarded seven slaves - Louisa, Caesar, Harriet, Patience, Glasgow, and Mingo. Nelly Collins was given the exclusive right of occupying the plantation of her deceased husband, but she was required to pay her daughter the annual rent of $15.90

By 1859, the two colored women employed their slaves in the planting of rice. Nelly Collins used her slaves to harvest 2,400 pounds of rice as well as 130 bushels of sweet potatoes and 125 bushels of Indian corn. Yet Jennette Collins produced more than four times the amount of rice that her mother produced, with an equal number of slaves and the same amount of land. Using slave labor, her farm yielded 10,000 pounds of rice, 800 bushels of sweet potatoes and 150 bushels of Indian corn. The market value of her rice, sweet potatoes, Indian corn, and hay amounted to $1,144.49, while the same four crops on the farm of her mother were worth $338.33.91

By and large, the colored rice planters of Charleston and Georgetown counties can be traced to the Holman family. For example, John and Samuel Holman of Georgetown District were brothers; their sisters were Elizabeth Holman Collins, Esther Holman Anderson, and Margaret Holman Collins. Elias, Robert, and Jonathan Collins were also brothers and Elias and Robert married Elizabeth and Margaret Holman, while their nephew, James Anderson, married Esther Holman. The three African women gave birth to several offspring, and each of the sisters had one child who followed the example of his or her father and planted rice. With the property provided by their parents, the children of the three African sisters entered the world of the rice planters.

Not all of the colored rice planters were related to each other by the bond of kinship. Alex Holmes of Georgetown County was not part of the Holman or the Collins clan. For more than 20 years, he worked as a carpenter before he acquired the capital needed to purchase slaves and land for rice planting. According to the 1850 census, the 70-year-old black farmer owned 12 slaves and a plantation which contained 1,550 acres of land. With the acquisition of slaves and land, he managed a plantation which yielded 16,300 pounds of rice, 1,000 bushels of sweet potatoes, and 400 bushels of Indian corn.92 By 1860, Alex Holmes had apparently become dissatisfied with his investment, because he liquidated all of his slaves except one 56-year-old male and divested himself of his plantation.93

Elsewhere in South Carolina, Frank Logan and his wife, Jane Logan, of St. Paul's Parish in Colleton District used their slaves to plant rice. In 1820, Frank Logan utilized seven field hands to harvest an estimated amount of rice which ranged between 14,175 and 25,200 pounds. By the next federal census, Frank Logan had died, but his wife took over the management of the rice farm and continued to plant the staple. In 1840, there were 12 slaves working in the rice fields, and they grew an estimated crop of rice which ranged between 24,300 and 43,200 pounds. In that year, Jane Logan was nearly 70 years old, and she did not live to be a part of the next federal census. Yet her death was not the end of the colored rice planters of Colleton County.94

During the period from 1810 to 1847, John Garden was the largest colored planter of St. Paul's Parish, but he used the Indian descent of his mother to escape the limitations of being classified as a free black. Yet both he and his mother, Flora Garden, associated with free coloreds and married into the caste of colored persons. In 1795, John Garden applied for membership into the colored fraternal society called the Brown Fellowship Society. Also, he married the daughter of George and Ruth Gardiner, who were free mulattoes of Charlestown. In addition, the second marriage of his mother, Flora Garden, was to a black man named Robert Baldwin. In spite of the fact that John Garden was designated as free Indian, his father may have been of African descent. But the laws of the state permitted persons of free Indian descent on their mothers' side to declare themselves as Indians." Although John Garden was closely aligned to the free black community, he rejected his African ancestry and used the heritage of his mother to avoid the special tax imposed on free Negroes as well as the other disadvantages of being classified as black. Without the limitations of being assigned to a so-called inferior class, he became

one of the largest non-white planters in the state.

When John Garden was 48 years old, he accumulated an estate that ranked him along the small planters of the state. In 1820, he owned 35 slaves and a plantation called Hermitage. And like the wealthy planters of Charleston and Colleton counties, he maintained a home in Charleston Neck where he often stayed. While residing in Charleston Neck, he hired an overseer to manage the plantation. Under the directions of John Garden, his overseer used 17 slaves in the rice fields and produced an estimated amount of rice which ranged between 34,425 and 61,200 pounds. Within ten years, John Garden increased the number of field hands employed on the Hermitage Plantation from 17 to 34 slaves and produced between 68,850 and 122,400 pounds of rice. By 1840 the 68-year-old planter owned 62 slaves, 40 of whom worked in the rice fields and grew between 81,000 and 144,000 pounds of rice. Within 20 years, John Garden acquired 62 slaves and a plantation which contained 382 acres of land, placing him among the large planters in South Carolina.96

As the wealth of John Garden grew, his health began to falter. Fearful that his death was imminent, he recorded his last will and testament in February 1847. In his last will, he stated:

> I desire all my Country property to be held by my Executors until all just debts are fully paid after which I desire the same to be sold to the best advantage and the proceeds equally divided between my following children, Viz: Ruth C. Garden, Ellen R. Bass, Frances M. Grant, Elias W. Garden, John Garden.
>
> Secondly I give to Susan Elizabeth Garden my wife my house and lot in Cannonsborough now occupied by me together with the furniture ... and the following servants Viz Clarissa and Hannah with their future issue and increase ...97

Shortly after the will was written, the 75-year-old planter died. After his death, the executors of John Garden managed the estate until a sale could be conducted.9'

For the next ten months, Elias W. Garden, the son and executor of John Garden, directed the daily operations on Hermitage Plantation. While managing the plantation, he used the slaves to harvest the last crop of rice on the estate of his deceased father. When the slaves finished their tasks, the rice crop sold for the net sum of $913.98. For his services as overseer, he charged the estate of his

father the sum of $177.14.99

Upon the completion of the harvest, Elias W. Garden was ready to follow the directions of his deceased father and sell both the slaves and the plantation. On November 23, 1847, he placed a notice in the Charleston Courier to inform the public that Hermitage Plantation and 60 slaves were to be auctioned by Thomas Hume. When the sale was conducted, the executors of John Garden sold Hermitage Plantation to William W. Westcoat for $8,000. Westcoat then purchased 40 slaves belonging to the deceased John Garden for $13,179. (Sixteen slaves on the plantation were retained by the Garden family for $4,205.) Unlike many of the colored planters, John Garden had demanded the liquidation of his estate, and the proceeds were divided between his heirs. Consequently, the auction ended the line of major colored planters in Colleton County, which could be traced back to James Pendarvis in 1798.100

For the most part, the colored rice planters of South Carolina needed the labor of slaves to plant and harvest their rice crops. Once the slaves and land were acquired, the network of kinship preserved the rice planta tions. When the colored planters rose to the ranks of major slaveowners and rice cultivators, they continued the production of the staple crop until death; then their children were provided with the necessary implements to work the plantations. Few colored planters started from poverty and ascended to the wealth of the rice planters. Clearly, the capital needed for large-scale production could not be obtained without the assistance of well-to-do benefactors, thereby limiting the number of free blacks who planted rice on commercial levels.

By the 1820s, cotton had replaced rice as the major staple grown in South Carolina. It dominated the plantation economy of nearly all of the counties in the state. The cotton belt ran from the low country (Beaufort, Charleston, Horry, Williamsburg), where the crop was grown in modest amounts, to within 20 miles of the Orangeburg-Barnwell lines. From the sandy soil of Abbeville County to the fertile lands of Richland County, the cash crop was also planted. As the crop spread into the upper counties of the state, it became the dominant staple by the 1830s. In fact, the upper counties (Abbeville, Anderson, Chester, Fairfield, Greenville, Lancaster, Laurens, Newberry, Pickens, Spartanburg) grew huge amounts of cotton. By 1849, the region produced 63,840,779 pounds of cotton, while the middle counties (Barnwell, Chesterfield, Clarendon, Darlington, Edgefield, Kershaw, Lexington, Marion, Marlboro, Orangeburg, Richland, Sumter) grew 53,285,661 pounds of cotton.10'

When cotton became the major staple of the South, it was not the crop of the wealthy, as was the rice, but the staple of the small farmers. The typical colored farmers who planted cotton were not the owners of slaves or large estates, but rather small farmers who used the labor of their families to cultivate the land. In 1849, Andrew Chisolm of Barnwell District was assisted by his wife, Betsey Chisolm, in the picking of two bales of cotton. As the family units grew, the number of workers increased, so that the colored farmers could produce more cotton. In 1859, John Hazel of Barnwell District employed the labor of himself and his wife, Mary Hazel, as well as their adult offspring, James, Joseph, and Richard Hazel, to pick 16 bales of cotton. Elsewhere in the state, Jesse Hamilton, a colored farmer of Chester County, owned 388 acres of land. With the aid of his wife and three adult offspring, the farm yielded 31 bales of cotton. Such family units were quite exceptional in South Carolina. Furthermore, the colored farmers who relied on the labor of their children eventually lost their supply of workers when their offspring left home and ventured out for themselves. Most free blacks who planted cotton were small farmers and could not afford the services of added laborers beyond their nuclear families. Yet a few of these small families grew into mediumsized production units and acquired the capital to purchase slaves, thereby guaranteeing the cultivation of cotton.102

Sometimes the small farmers of African descent worked their own land until they obtained the money to purchase slaves. In 1833, Wade Sanders of Newberry District bought 160 acres of land from Jacob Duchill for $300. At first, Sanders and his wife provided all the labor as they worked the soil of their small farm. By 1849, their children were of the age to assist them in the chores of the farm. In that year, they improved 100 acres of land which yielded 16 bales of cotton, 200 bushels sweet potatoes, and 500 bushels of Indian corn. 101 Without using the labor of slaves, the Sanders family planted a crop of cotton which was valued at $537.60. But during the following years, Wade Sanders used the proceeds from the cotton to purchase seven slaves. In 1860, he owned a slave community which consisted of a 31-year-old male and six females who were 26, 24, 21, 19, 18, and 10 years of age. Through the industry of Wade Sanders and his family, he was able to acquire slave workers within 17 years after the purchase of his farm. 104

After the purchase of the field hands, the output on the farm of Wade Sanders increased from the planting season of 1849. In that year, the colored family grew only 16 bales of cotton. But ten years

later, the family used the labor of slaves, and the amount of cotton increased by 32.8 percent, or 7 bales, over the level in 1849. In fact, nearly all of the crops planted were more plentiful than in the previous decade. For example, the crop of corn grew by 16.6 percent, while the production of oats increased by 60 percent. Furthermore, the amount of improved land grew from 100 to 150 acres of tilled soil. Like many farmers, Wade Sanders wanted to produce more cotton, but without the services of a stable work force, he could not achieve that objective. So when he acquired his slaves, he purchased a permanent labor force-laborers who would not pursue their own interests as his offspring were prone to do when they reached maturity, but who could be used for many years to come.101

Once the cotton planters bought their slaves, they used the labor of their servants to till the soil. In February, the male slaves prepared the soil for the upcoming harvest by plowing under the old crops. With the power of mules, the field hands turned the earth, in order to cut up and destroy the worms and insects which could infect the cotton fields. When this task was completed, the next phase of cotton planting did not begin until the next month.

By March the field hands plowed the soil and prepared to plant the cotton seeds. Using the aid of a mule, the male slaves turned the earth into ridges which were six feet wide from water furrow to water furrow. Then the slaves applied a lighter plowing for the planting of the seeds. Usually female slaves sowed the cotton seeds by hand. After the task was finished, the slaves used a harrow, which was drawn by mules, and covered the seeds with earth. When the seedlings sprouted, the arduous task of tending the cotton commenced.

In May, the slaves were sent into the fields to remove unwanted grass and weeds which accumulated around the plant. To dislodge undesirable material, the field hands plowed as close as possible to the plant on both sides, scraping the dirt and the grass away from the cotton. Then a group of slaves followed with their hoes and cut up the grass. Not only was it necessary that the slaves remove all of the grass, but the plants had to be chopped out with the hoes and spaced about ten to twelve inches apart. After the plants were spaced apart, the slaves still had to hoe the fields and kill any grass between the rows. The task of hoeing would not be completed until July.

By late August the cotton was ready to be picked. At that time, each slave was given a sack, which was fastened to his or her neck by a strap. Then the slaves commenced to pick the cotton. When their sacks were full, they emptied them into large baskets which were

placed at the beginning of the rows. As the sky began to darken, the slaves were forced to end their picking for the day, but their tasks continued into the night. They still had to carry the baskets full of cotton to the storage house, so that the cotton could be weighed and kept until it was ginned and sold. 106

On the plantations of the large colored planters, there were cotton gins. In 1850, the cotton gins cost about $150 and were well within the budget of the well-to-do planters of African descent. In 1861, for example, the plantation of William Ellison was equipped with five new gins, which were worth $810. The labor-saving device was worth the expense because it performed the task which at one time required the services of several slaves. Before the cotton gin was invented, it took a single slave one whole day to gin one pound of cotton by hand. But the original cotton gin made by Eli Whitney could gin 50 pounds of cotton in a single day. By the 1830s, the cotton gin was an established and important implement on the plantations of many cotton growers. The cotton farmers who could not afford the device often used the gins of neighboring planters. Once the cotton was ginned, it was pressed into bales by means of a screw, then covered with bagging and tied by ropes. Then the bales were ready to be sent to market and sold. 101

The routine of the colored planters did not differ from the white planters with a similar number of slaves. For example, the plantation of John H. Berry of Barnwell County was operated in the same manner as those of his white neighbors. In 1848, Berry sold a 24-year-old black woman named Hannah and her child to Joseph F. Biniker for $550. Like many planters, he occasionally had to liquidate his human chattel to avoid financial difficulties. By 1850, Berry owned nine slaves, three of whom were adults and used as field hands. His small task force cleared 60 acres of land which yielded 5 bales of cotton, 100 bushels of peas, and 300 bushels of Indian corn. Within ten years, his labor force had increased from three to five adult workers. As a result of the added field hands, the output of the farm made substantial gains. 101 In 1859, John H. Berry used his slaves to improve 200 acres of land and harvested 22 bales of cotton, 100 bushels of sweet potatoes, 200 bushels of peas, and 700 bushels of Indian corn. Clearly, the desire to produce more agricultural goods compelled him to increase the number of workers. Like many planters, he was aware that increased production resulted in more revenue; there was thus a stimulus not only to produce more but to acquire added laborers. 109

The financial benefits of cotton planting were responsible for

several colored farmers' utilization of slave labor. In 1860, Lewis Kinsey, a mulatto planter of Barnwell County, owned nineteen slaves, nine of whom were employed as field hands. On his plantation, the field hands grew 19 bales of cotton, 150 bushels of peas, and 1,000 bushels of Indian corn. The revenue from the cotton was about $912, while the corn crop was estimated at $903. Quite often, the planters grew more corn than they could consume and sold the surplus to planters who did not cultivate enough of the grain to feed their slaves. In Edgefield County, George Quarles, a 60-year-old black farmer and the owner of two field hands, planted cotton as well as a surplus of corn. In 1859, he grew 12 bales of cotton, which were worth $576. But he also cultivated more corn than his family or slaves could have consumed. When Quarles planted 400 bushels of Indian corn, he intended to sell the surplus to planters who grew insufficient amounts of corn. With the sale of the grain, he augmented the revenue from his farm and moved away from a single cash crop.10

Yet many planters relied on the cultivation of cotton as their single source of revenue and either refused or were unable to diversify their farms. In 1859, Daria Thomas, a mulatto planter of Union County, used his field hands to focus solely on the planting of cotton. The slaves of Daria Thomas improved 150 acres of land and grew 16 bales of cotton, 50 bushels of Indian corn, 50 bushels of peas, and 100 bushels of sweet potatoes. When the cotton was marketed, it sold for about $768. The value of the other agricultural goods amounted to only S139.1 11

In Charleston City, the elite members of the free black community invested their earnings in plantations. For example, Joseph Hanscome, the son of a wealthy white planter and a colored mother, used the money that he inherited from his father to purchase land and slaves. On August 1, 1833, Joseph Hanscome bought Woodland Plantation, which was situated in St. James & Goose Creek Parish of Charleston District and contained 600 acres of land, from Edward H. Edwards for $5,000. Shortly after the purchase, he moved his family and his city slaves from their home on Green Hill Street and relocated in the parish of St. James & Goose Creek. With the labor provided by his urban servants, he planted a small amount of cotton. Like most city slaves, however, his servants were not prepared for the arduous life of the field hands. And so it became necessary for him to purchase workers who were accustomed to agricultural labor. Within two years of the acquisition of Woodland Plantation, he purchased ten field hands. On January 27, 1835, Joseph Hanscome took advantage of the estate auction conducted by the executors of the deceased Mrs.

S. Parker, who had resided on a neighboring plantation, and procured for $3,700 the following slaves: July, Lydia, Ive, Kit, Vensus, Adam, Billy, Owen, and Nelly.12.

By 1835 Joseph Hanscome owned sixteen slaves, ten of whom were used as field hands. With the added workers, he planted a modest amount of cotton. Since Hanscome did not record the amount of cotton grown, the average yield of cotton in that area has been used to determine the number of bales cultivated. According to the study of Edward Saraydar, the average yield per hand was 2.8 bales of cotton. Using that estimate, the slaves of Joseph Hanscome produced 28 bales of cotton, which were worth $1,792. For the next three years, he used his slaves to till the soil of Woodland Plantation until his death in the winter of 1838."'

Before the death of Joseph Hanscome, he requested that his estate should be sold. In order to liquidate the estate, the executors of Joseph Hanscome advertised the auction in the Charleston Mercury. On January 1, 1839, the Mercury reported that 15 slaves - Jacob (a carpenter), July (a field hand), Kitty (a field hand), Billy (a field hand), Adam (a field hand), Nell, Jack, Hannah, Liddy, Vensus, Peggy, Grace, Nelly, Delia, and Delia's child - would be sold nine days later at the north side of the custom house in Charleston City. The Mercury also ran the advertisement for the sale of Woodland Plantation. "4

Estate Sale by Elliot, Condy, & Dawes

> On Thursday 10th January, will be sold, at 11 o'clock at the North side of Custom House, The valuable and pleasantly situated Plantation, called Woodland, containing 600 acres of Land ... situated 15 miles from town ... On the plantation there is a fine Dwelling House, on a high basement, containing 6 rooms, with Piazzas to North and South. All the buildings are in good order, consisting of kitchen, Servant House, and Negro Houses with brick chimneys."'

When the sale was conducted, Woodland Plantation sold for $3,600. Sixteen slaves formerly belonging to the deceased Joseph Hanscome were auctioned for $10,340. In addition, the furniture, livestock, plantation implements, and provisions together sold for $1,295.85. Among the items auctioned were cotton seeds, corn, fodder, a mahogany tea table, and other miscellaneous property. The total proceeds from the auction came to $15,235.85, which was to be used by the executors of Joseph Hanscome to pay any debts incurred. The residue of the money would be invested in stock and bonds for

the benefit of his wife. 16

Joseph Hanscome was able to invest $8,700 in slaves and land within a period of two years. Undoubtedly the high price of cotton during the early 1830s was the prime motive for his costly investment. But unlike Hanscome, it took most colored planters years to acquire the money to invest in slaves and land. By 1860, William Jones, a 70-year-old mulatto of St. Luke's Parish in Beaufort County, had acquired the funds to purchase slaves. Before the acquisition, he had worked as a carpenter in the county. Eventually, he saved enough money to buy three field hands to work the small farm that he owned in 1859. Once the field hands cleared 100 acres of land for planting, they cultivated 7 bales of cotton, 50 bushels of peas, 200 bushels of sweet potatoes, and 500 bushels of Indian corn. Elsewhere in the county, Peter Jackson of Prince William Parish bought two field hands by 1860. Yet it was not until the mulatto planter was in his seventies that he acquired the slaves. The 78-year-old slaveowner used his slaves to plant 3 bales of cotton. In Lexington County, Sarah Bowers, a mulatto slave master, used her 36-year-old male slave to till 15 acres of land, which yielded 1 bale of cotton, 1 bushel of Irish potatoes, and 25 bushels of Indian corn in 1859. Sarah Bowers and her husband had waited several years before they purchased the slave. Although it took nearly a decade for some colored farmers to buy slaves, they viewed their acquisitions not only as a means of providing labor but an investment by which they could graduate into the planter class."7

The more ambitious and capable colored farmers occasionally did rise to the planter class. For instance, William Ellison not only went from slavery to freedom, but became the largest acknowledged colored cotton planter in South Carolina. After spending 25 years of his life as a slave, he was able to acquire 70 slaves and a plantation which yielded 100 bales of cotton in 1861. The rise of William Ellison to prominence took more than half of a century to accomplish.

When William Ellison was born in Fairfield District in 1791, the chance that he would be something more than a slave seemed remote. Yet there was something special about this slave child which separated him from the other children on the plantation of his owner. The most noticeable difference was the parentage of the slave child. The mulatto boy was probably the offspring of his master, who was also named William Ellison. As the child of William Ellison, he was not treated as an ordinary slave. When the boy reached adulthood, his master sent him to Captain William McCreighton to be taught a trade. Under the guidance of Captain McCreighton, the mulatto man was trained in the skill of making and repairing cotton gins. Occasionally

the mulatto children of slaveowners were trained as artisans in order that they would be capable of earning a livelihood, which prepared them for manumission.

Indeed, William Ellison's training was preparing him to embark upon a new life as a freeman. On June 8, 1816, he was emancipated by his owner. Shortly after the emancipation, he journeyed to Sumter District and pursued his trade as a cotton gin maker and repairer. In February 1817, he placed a notice in the Camden Gazette and alerted the public that he was ready for business." In the notice, he stated that having served as an apprentice to William McCreighton, he had established himself at Stateburg in the county of Sumter and would make or repair cotton gins. Within three years after the advertisement, he purchased two slaves. The proceeds from the cotton gin shop allowed him to invest in slaves and facilitated his development as a large planter. 19

By 1820, William Ellison had gone from slavery to freedom to slaveownership. According to the federal enumeration, he owned two male slaves. The slaves probably worked in the cotton gin shop because the census reported that three persons were employed as manufacturers in the household, but Ellison and his slaves were the only persons capable of working in the business. In addition to the census report, Robert W. Anderson, a hotel keeper of Sumter, recalled that Ellison owned "a valuable slave, who was a fine mechanic and cotton gin maker.'" 10 As the cotton gin business of William Ellison increased, he added two more male slaves to his labor force, bringing his holding to four male workers by 1830. But the small number of slaves owned by Ellison was not sufficient for large-scale cotton production.121

It was not until the middle part of 1830 that William Ellison purchased the land and slaves needed to work a cotton plantation. On November 7, 1835, he bought two tracts of land from Stephen D. Miller, the former governor of South Carolina, for $1,120. The first tract of land that he acquired was situated near Bracey's Woodland and ran to a large oak tree near the settlement of Mrs. Howard, then to a corner of land owned by Stephen D. Miller and Thomas Sumter, then to land owned by Thomas Sumter near the Camden Road. The second tract of land was above the Garners Terry Road and contained 54 acres of land.122

Then, in January 1838, Ellison bought 65'h acres of land for $581.50: one year later, he purchased 216 acres of land for $5,000. By 1840, Ellison owned a plantation which contained 335'h acres of land,

but he still lacked the laborers for major cotton production.121

After William Ellison bought these tracts of land, the next step was to acquire slaves, but the profits from the cotton gin shop were not sufficient to buy the field hands needed to till the soil. In order to obtain enough capital to equip his plantation with laborers, he used the artisan slaves named Marlbourgh, Minto, and John as collateral to secure a loan from John G. Herriot for $5,094.68 in 1837. With the money from the loan, he increased his slaveholding from four slaves in 1830 to thirty slaves in 1840.

With the added laborers, he planted a modest amount of cotton. According to the sixth federal census, there were eleven slaves employed as agricultural workers. They produced an amount of cotton which can be estimated at about 30 bales. With land and slaves, Ellison was on the verge of becoming a large planter, but he did not reach that plateau until the late 1850s.' 24

Between 1849 and 1859, the output of Ellison Plantation grew from the production of a large farm to that of a modest plantation. Within ten years, he increased the cultivation of cotton by 128.5 percent. In fact, the output of all agricultural goods grew by more than 50 percent. The growth of Ellison Plantation could not have been accomplished without the labor of slaves.

In 1849, William Ellison used 26 slaves to cultivate 200 acres of land which yielded 35 bales of cotton. Then ten years later, the number of laborers increased to 35 slaves who cultivated 80 bales of cotton. Although the added field hands were an important element which attributed to the increased production, the rise in the productivity of the slaves prompted the growth of the plantation. In 1849, for example, the field hands averaged only 1.3 bales of cotton but a decade later the average per worker rose to 2.2 bales of cotton. Ellison's efficient use of slave labor allowed him to increase the output of his plantation and thereby make more money. When Ellison sold his 80 bales of cotton in 1859, he received $3,840. In 1861, he used the labor of slaves to produce 100 bales of cotton which was valued at $4,000.121

For most black planters, the primary motive for purchasing slaves was to exploit their labor for profit. The revenue to be made in cultivation of staple crops inspired the free black planters to invest in slaves and land. As long as the colored planters could extract a profit from slavery, they would not forsake their valuable investments but sought to increase production and earn more revenue from their

plantations.

However, the typical colored farmer who owned slaves did not grow rice or cotton. He was a small cultivator who acquired from two to as many as seven slaves to be employed as field hands. These colored slaveowners used slaves to cultivate small plots of land and sold the surplus produced to large planters who concentrated on the production of staple crops. In 1850, Jonathan Eady, a colored farmer of St. Stephen's Parish in Charleston County, owned six slaves, four of whom were between 20 and 45 years old and used as field hands. His slaves tilled 100 acres of land and grew 450 bushels of Indian corn. Once Eady extracted the amount of produce needed to sustain his family and slaves, he sold the surplus. In the winter of 1860, his slaves produced a surplus of corn and peas which was valued at $348. Elsewhere, in the summer of 1858, John Connor, a farmer of African descent from St. James & Goose Creek Parish, used four slaves to plant a surplus of Indian corn which amounted to 150 bushels. During the following winter, the corn was sold for $75.126 Clearly these small slaveowners were subsistence farmers, making enough money from the land to meet their most essential needs, with little capital for investments.

Many of the small colored farmers would not have acquired slaves had they not inherited their human property from relatives. Many colored slaveowners kept their bondsmen and their land within their families. In 1834, Daniel Eady, a colored farmer of St. John's Berkeley Parish in Charleston District, gave his daughter Esther Bluit the use of three slaves named Catherine, Isaac, and William. When Esther Bluit died, the slaves were inherited by her cousin Jonathan Eady, who used the slaves Isaac and William as field hands.127 Also, Susannah Eady, the aunt of Jonathan Eady, requested that her nephew should be given her slave Mariah and all of her plantation implements and livestock.'28

Table 7.3. Production Figures for the Ellison Plantation in Sumter County, South Carolina, 1849–1861.

Produce	1849	1859	1861	Percentage of Increase Between	
				1849–1859	1859–1861
Cotton (bales)	35	80	100	128.5	20.00
Indian corn (bu.)	1200	2000	2000	66.6	
Peas & beans (bu.)	100	200	200	100.0	
Sweet potatoes (bu.)	100	1000		900.0	

Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule IV, Sumter County, South Carolina, pp. 707-708; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule IV, Sumter County, South Carolina, pp. 21-22; Inventories vol. A 1858-1868 (Sumter County), pp. 216-217.

Quite often the colored heirs were the offspring of white slave masters who owned several slaves that they allotted to their children. In 1832, the mulatto children of Henry Glencamp and his colored mistress of St. Stephen's Parish were provided with a total of 18 slaves. Under a decree from the Court of Equity in Charleston County, Henry Glencamp, Jr., received three slaves named Billy, Lucy, and Susy while his sister Nancy Lewis was given two slaves named John and Peter. The remaining slaves were divided between Isaac Glencamp, Christiana Harris, and Nancy Palmer, but only two of the heirs used their slaves as field hands in 1849. In that year, Henry Glencamp, Jr., used his slaves to plant 200 bushels of Indian corn and 200 bushels of sweet potatoes. Henry Glencamp continued to utilize the labor of slaves until the state surrendered to the Union Army. His brother, Isaac Glencamp, employed three slaves named James, Nancy, and William as field hands to plant corn, sweet potatoes, and peas. In 1855, Isaac Glencamp became gravely sick and subsequently died. His widow decided to sell some of the slaves belonging to the deceased man. On December 3, 1855, Rebecca Glencamp sold James, William, and Nancy for $1,837. Then she parted with her servant Mary and Mary's children, Selina, Phillip, and Henry, for $1,280.129

By the 1850s, the small colored farmers had begun to reassess their commitment to chattel slavery. As the antislavery movement intensified its agitation, the conflict produced a sense of impending crisis. Many colored slaveowners began to doubt the continued

existence of slavery. Furthermore, the low returns from slavery caused them to sell their bondsmen; yet, before the auction, they extracted all the labor which could be obtained from their slaves. In other words, the colored farmers requested that their slaves should be sold after their death rather than given to kinsfolk. Unlike the 1820s and the 1830s, when the colored masters often gave their slaves to relatives, few slaveowners provided their children with slaves during the 1850s, but liquidated their human chattel and bequeathed the proceeds from the sale to their loved ones. For instance, when the husband of Sarah Conner died, she sold all of the slaves belonging to her deceased spouse. On February 1, 1859, she parted with Daphney, Bill, Christiana, and George for $1,865. When the small colored farmers began to see slavery as a short-term investment, they chose not to pass their slaves onto their heirs, and the number of small slaveholding farmers decreased. In 1849, for example, there were only seventeen colored farmers who owned fewer than eight slaves and did not plant a staple crop. By 1859 the number declined to eleven. The decrease can be attributed to the liquidation of several estates belonging to colored masters. 110

In spite of the reluctance of small colored farmers to own slaves, they continued to do so. In Barnwell County, Zed Chavous, a 65-year-old farmer, owned two slaves who cleared 25 acres of land in 1849. Across the county line, Martha Ardis of Edgefield County used her 30-year-old male slave in the planting of corn, peas, and sweet potatoes. And north of Edgefield County, John Bar, a mulatto farmer of Orangeburgh District, owned seven slaves, four of whom were employed as field hands and produced 200 bushels of sweet potatoes and 550 bushels of Indian corn.' 31

For the most part, the colored masters who were planters used the labor of slaves because they sought to produce crops on a commercial scale and thus needed the services of several workers. Even the small farmers purchased slaves to be employed as farm workers on their subsistence operations. Many of these small farmers hoped that they would develop into large cultivators. To them, the exploitation of slave labor was a means of achieving their goals.

Chapter Eight

Free Black Artisans: A Need for Labor

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, there existed a small but vibrant class of free black artisans in the urban communities of South Carolina. Even though the source of the Southern economy stemmed from the plantation system, the majority of free blacks could not obtain the capital to invest in land and slaves for rice or cotton planting. As a result of the shortages of skilled workers and manufactured goods, many plantations were not self-contained units and had to seek the urban centers as a source for skills and goods which could not be furnished by slaves. Meanwhile, the plantations provided the towns with agricultural goods; thus a network of interdependence was formed between rural and urban communities. As the southern economy grew and small towns became cities, many free blacks benefitted from the expansion. With the growth of the urban communities, free persons of color were employed as barbers, bricklayers, cabinet makers, carpenters, caterers, coopers, cotton gin makers, mantua makers, millwrights, pastry cooks, seamstresses, shoemakers, and tailors. Once they entered their trades and began to prosper, the colored artisans wanted to expand their businesses, but expansion usually entailed the acquisition of added laborers. Since most of the available workers were bondsmen, the colored artisans found themselves purchasing slaves to be employed as laborers.

Unlike the colored planters of the countryside, the colored artisans did not require much capital to start their businesses. Usually, they needed only the tools of their trade and a place to conduct their work. In many instances, the homes of black artisans served as their workshops only until they purchased more suitable shops in the business districts. Yet many artisans worked in trades which could be performed in the confines of their own homes and required no special place of work. For example, the seamstress easily accomplished her tasks within the home. Other skills could be furnished outside of both the home environment and the workshop. For the most part, the carpenter was employed on projects which demanded only the sweat of his brow and the tools to perform the job. Thus, with only a minimal amount of capital invested in their trades, the colored artisans soon began to prosper.

In many instances, the success of the artisan of African descent was manifested in his acquisition of slaves. As early as the eighteenth century, the well-to-do bricklayers purchased slaves to be employed as workers. When the demand for the skills of bricklayers increased, they often used slaves as bricklayers. During the 1770s, there was a great demand for the services of bricklayer, builders, carpenters, and plasterers because the Revolutionary War and the fire of 1778 caused much destruction, prompting a revival of construction in Charlestown. Consequently, the colored bricklayers found an eager market for their skills.' In 1787, William Raper, a free mulatto of Charlestown, used the labor of four adult males in the bricklaying business. Raper employed his slaves named Jimmy, Tom, and Ishmael as bricklayers, while Paul worked as a laborer. The number of skilled slaves owned by William Raper suggests that there was a great demand for his trade. As the restoration of Charlestown continued, he needed the four workers to fully exploit the growing demands for bricklayers.'

William Raper had accumulated a modest estate when the restoration of Charlestown began to subside. By 1788, Susanna Cole Raper, the widow of William Raper, reported that her husband owned nine slaves who were appraised at 466 pounds sterling, 8 shillings, and 9 pence. Raper owned not only artisan slaves, but also house servants. According to the inventory of the deceased man, he held a house boy named Bob and a washerwoman named Tamer. He also owned three females named Bella, Clarissa, and Betty, whose occupations were not recorded by Mrs. Raper.'

When William Raper recorded his last will and testament, he made provisions to provide his loved ones with slaves. In the will, he requested that Susanna Cole Raper should have the use of the slaves named Tom, Tamer, and Bella until her death; then the slaves would become the property of his granddaughter, Elizabeth Susan Gardiner. Also Raper declared that the mulatto boy John (the son of Tamer) should faithfully serve his wife until the lad reached the age of 25 years old. The slave was then to be emancipated by the executors of William Raper. But the other slaves mentioned in the will of the colored bricklayer were doomed to remain in servitude until death.4

Upon the death of Susanna Cole Raper, the slaves provided by her husband were inherited by Elizabeth Susan Gardiner in 1789. While the granddaughter of William and Susanna Raper was a minor, the father of the colored girl employed the slaves as laborers.

Quite often the colored artisans provided their offspring and grandchildren with slaves to assist them as entrepreneurs. If the heirs

were minors, the slaves were held in trust by the parents until the offspring were capable of managing the property themselves. For eight years, George Gardiner, a mulatto bricklayer of Charlestown, retained the use of the slaves belonging to his daughter Elizabeth, until he died in 1797. Then the wife of George Gardiner served as the guardian of her daughter and utilized the slaves. In the inventory of George Gardiner, the following slaves were recorded: Frank (a laborer), Jack (a laborer), Paul (a laborer), Bob (a bricklayer), Betty (a house servant), and Clarissa and her child Mary. While George Gardiner was alive, the colored bricklayer used the slaves as workers in the bricklaying business.'

Not all of the colored artisans chose to provide their heirs with slaves. In 1771, Thomas Cole, a mulatto and a bricklayer of Charlestown, directed his executors to sell three slaves named Prince, Will, and Carolina. He requested that the proceeds from the sale of the slaves be equally divided between his five children, Thomas, Barbara, William, Elizabeth, and John Cole.6

As the bricklayers of African ancestry became firmly committed to slavery, the institution gradually developed into a way of life. Consequently, they acquired slaves not only to be used as skilled and unskilled workers in their businesses but as domestic servants to be employed in their households.

The slaveowning bricklayers of Negro descent were not peculiar to the eighteenth century. During the nineteenth century, there were colored bricklayers who owned slaves in Charleston City, and their ownership of slaves continued during the Civil War. In 1850, Paul Wigfall owned six male slaves whose ages were reported to be 50, 36, 36, 34, 21, and 17 years old. These slaves formed the nucleus of his labor force and assisted him in the construction of several buildings in the city. For example, Wigfall was hired by Julia Dupie to construct a two-story building which was to consist of one attic, four fireplaces and six rooms. Without the services of slave labor, such a job would have been virtually impossible for him to finish. After the house was completed, he was paid $1,110.

By 1860, three bricklayers of African ancestry owned slaves in Charleston City. Edward Palmer used the labor of a 30-year-old male to assist him in the bricklaying trade. Palmer also owned a 35-year-old female named Peggy, who probably worked as a domestic servant for the colored family. The other slaveowning bricklayers were Samuel Austin and Francis Perry. All three of the colored bricklayers continued to hold slaves during the turmoil of the Civil War.'

The labor of slaves was used not only by colored bricklayers, but also by carpenters. In 1823, Peter Simpson, a free black of Charleston City, bought a carpenter named Jack for $300. Because the demand for his services had increased, he purchased the artisan-slave to be used as an assistant. During the 1820s and the 1830s, Thomas Small, Sr., used the labor of two male slaves as carpenters. In 1823, he purchased a 17-year-old boy named Richard from John Peter Young of Charleston City. For the next two years, he trained the young slave and later employed him as an apprentice. Upon the completion of his apprenticeship, Richard was sold by his black master for $425." Thomas Small also disposed of a carpenter named Josiah for $550 in 1834.9 Apparently, Small purchased slaves to be utilized as workers, but when the demand for his trade declined, he relieved himself of the artisan-slaves for a profit.

Between 1830 and 1850, the number of slaveowning carpenters of African descent ranged from seven to ten masters in Charleston City. In 1830, the following ten carpenters owned slaves: Frank Crawley, James Gordon, Richard Holloway, Sr., Benjamin Lawrence, George Mathews, Peter Mathews, James Maxwell, John McBeth, Thomas Small, Sr., and Smart Simpson. The slaveowning carpenters of 1830 held 61 slaves or an average of 6.1 bondsmen each.' By 1840 the number of slaveowners had declined to nine masters, who were Thomas Cole, John Drayton, Henry Francis, Richard Holloway, Jr., Richard Holloway, Sr., Sam Mathews, James Maxwell, Stephen McLane, and Edward White. They owned 35 slaves and held an average of 3.8 bondsmen each." According to the seventh census of 1850, there were seven colored carpenters designated as slaveowners: Richard Holloway, Jr., Nero Horlbeck, Abraham Jones, John Lewis, Stephen McLane, Joshua Mishaw, and Edward White held 23 slaves. In 1860, the number of black carpenters who owned slaves remained at seven masters, but they held only sixteen slaves. These slaveholding carpenters were Friday Evans, Charles Holloway, Richard Holloway, Jr., Peter Mathews, Stephen McLane, Richard Small, and Thomas Small, Jr. After 1830, the number of slaveowning carpenters of African ancestry declined until it stabilized at seven masters in 1860. However, the number of slaves continued to decrease until it reached just sixteen slaves. Within one year of the surrender of South Carolina to the Union Army, there were only nine slaves held by four colored carpenters, Charles Holloway, Peter Mathews, Thomas Small, and Edward White.12

Many of the slaveholding carpenters of African ancestry acquired slaves to be utilized as workers. During the 1830s and the 1840s,

Richard Holloway, Sr., employed a slave named Cato, probably as a carpenter. Holloway continued to use the labor of Cato until 1845, when he sold the slave to his son, Richard Holloway, Jr." The son also used the labor of the slave as an artisan until the servant died in 1851. Yet the death of Cato did not end the slaveholding of Richard Holloway, Jr., but forced him to acquire a slave to replace the deceased Cato. By 1860, Richard Holloway, Jr., had acquired a 16-year-old boy, who probably was employed as an apprentice to the colored carpenter. In fact, the majority of the slaveowning carpenters owned at least one male slave who was probably employed as a laborer. In 1850, for example, 4 out of 7 colored carpenters held at least one male slave who was between 14 and 49 years old." The carpenters who owned male slaves capable of working probably used them as workers, because all of the male slaves were reported to be black while the owners of the slaves were mulattoes; thus the ties of kinship did not exist. With no bond of kinship, the motive for acquiring male slaves capable of working must have centered upon the demand for laborers. Even the three carpenters who did not purchase male slaves but bought adult female slaves probably used their slaves as laborers. Quite often the well-to-do carpenters purchased female slaves to be employed as domestic servants or hired out to non-slaveowners. In 1860, for example, Green Guignard, a 75-year-old carpenter of Richland County, owned three female slaves whose ages were 52, 50, and 37 years old. Undoubtedly, Guignard used the female slaves as workers to serve his family or to be hired out to non slaveowners, because he informed the census taker that his 37-year-old slave was a fugitive. Clearly, there was no bond of kinship between Guignard and his slaves.' 5

Like the men in these examples, the majority of the slaveowning carpenters of Negro ancestry acquired slaves to be used as workers. These colored carpenters employed their slaves as apprentices, carpenters, domestic servants, and as hired out workers.

The colored artisans who made cotton gins and threshing machines used the services of slave workers. In Sumter District, the Ellison family utilized the labor of slaves in the cotton gin-making business. In 1817, William Ellison, the patriarch of the family, established himself in Sumter District and started to make and repair cotton gins. Within two years after his arrival in the county, he acquired two male slaves to work in his shop. By 1830 he used four artisan-slaves to assist him in the business. Since the price of cotton was high during the 1830s and the production of the staple had increased, he found an eager market for his trade. Consequently, he

increased the number of slaves working in the cotton gin shop from four to twelve laborers by 1840. A decade later, he maintained his labor force at twelve workers.' 6

William Ellison needed the efforts of both unskilled and skilled workers to construct the cotton gin. For instance, the unskilled slaves of Ellison were assigned the task of cutting hickory and pine trees from his land. Once the trees were chopped down and hauled to his workshop, the wood was used to make the frame of the cotton gin. His artisan-slaves turned and grooved the wood by hand until the desired product was constructed. While that task was being performed, his slave blacksmith tempered the saw which cuts the cotton from the seed. The teeth of the implement were made with a file by hand. Once the cotton gin was completed, it was ready to be marketed.17

During the year of 1849, the slaves of William Ellison made 15 cotton gins which together sold for $1,000. Clearly, William Ellison needed many laborers to make 15 cotton gins, and those laborers were primarily slaves.'"

The artisan-slaves of William Ellison provided many other services besides making cotton gins. In 1857, the slave blacksmith made a bulltongue plow for Hugh Graham. Also, on the 27th of June, he made a new plow out of an old one for $1.50. For repairing a small mill spindle, the artisan-slave earned his master the sum of $5. The use of slave labor was a significant part of the life of William Ellison and contributed to the success and wealth of the colored artisan. In fact, the gross return from the blacksmith shop owned by Ellison and worked with the labor of slaves was reported to be $1,500 for the year of 1849.19

By the 1850s, Henry, Reuben, and William Ellison, Jr., the sons of William Ellison, began to play a more important role in the cotton gin shop. All of the sons were trained as cotton gin makers and were capable of managing the shop. As the health of William Ellison started to falter, he directed his sons in some of the minor details of running the business. On March 26, 1857, he wrote to Henry Ellison and told his son to purchase "two hand saws from Mr. Adger for the shop."20 After the death of William Ellison, his sons took over the cotton gin and blacksmith businesses. With the artisan-slaves provided by their father, they continued to manage the two shops until the end of the Civil War.'-'

Although the sons of William Ellison were provided with slaves by their father, they all owned slaves before the execution of their

father's last will and testament. In 1850, Henry Ellison owned two slaves, while both of his brothers utilized the labor of one slave. Both Reuben and William Ellison, Jr., held only adult female slaves. Like many well-to-do businessmen, they acquired domestic servants to fulfill the needs of their families. For 14 years, Hannah, the slave of Reuben Ellison, served her master until he died in May 1864. From 1830 until 1865, the Ellison family were the only colored people to use the labor of slaves in Sumter District.22

In Charleston City, there were a few colored artisans who benefitted from their mechanical talents and purchased slaves. In 1860, six out of fifteen mechanics and millwrights owned slaves in the port city. Six colored artisans named Amos Baxter, William P. DaCosta, Alfred Grant, William Jackson, Frederick C. Sasportas, and Anthony Weston held a total of 39 slaves. The majority of these artisans either used their bondsmen as skilled workers or as house servants. In 1839, Maria Weston, the wife of Anthony Weston, bought a millwright named Harry to be employed in the establishment owned by her husband. Mr. Weston used the artisan-slave to help him build a number of threshing machines for the planters of Charleston District. Even before Anthony Weston acquired the services of Harry, he owned five artisan-slaves named John, George, Alex, Bob, and Sandy, who were purchased for $4,550. On the estates of many rice planters, there were threshing machines which occasionally wore out or needed to be repaired, providing a market for the millwright's services. Clearly, these circumstances increased the business of Anthony Weston as well as other millwrights and compelled them to purchase slaves. The profits earned from the rice planters allowed Weston to purchase a total of thirteen bondsmen over a period of four years for the sum of $7,675.23

For the most part, the slaveholding millwrights of African ancestry owned two or three male slaves, who were employed as artisans. In 1850, Richmond Kinlock used the labor of two male slaves whose ages were 41 and 36 years old. In that same year, William Clark also owned two male slaves who were 40 and 31 years old and employed as millwrights. Quite often the colored artisans purchased young male slaves who were instructed in the trades of their masters. In 1833, Stanhope Fowler, a free mulatto and a millwright from St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, bought a 13-year-old boy named William from Jacob Bond-Ion for $500. After Fowler had trained the lad, he used the slave boy to assist him in the making and repairing of threshing machines. William remained in the service of Stanhope Fowler and continued to work for his master until the conclusion of the Civil War.24

Not all of the slaveowning millwrights of Negro heritage used their slaves as artisans. Once the colored artisans began to prosper, their lifestyle and desires were altered to meet their status. And so they occasionally purchased domestic servants to do the mundane chores of their households. In 1849, Frederick C. Sasportas, a free mulatto and a millwright from Charleston Neck, purchased a mulatto woman named Adeline for $449. For the next two years, the mulatto woman worked in the household of her master until she was sold by her colored owner in 1851. A few years after Sasportas sold Adeline, he purchased a 17-year-old woman named Ellen to attend his needs. Elsewhere in Charleston County, Benjamin Kinlock, a millwright and the brother of Richmond Kinlock, used the services of two female slaves whose ages were 41 and 31 years old. Since Kinlock's family consisted of three adults and six children, the female slaves performed numerous tasks and worked as babysitters, cooks, maids, and washerwomen.25 Thus the majority of the colored mechanics and millwrights who owned slaves used their bondsmen as both unskilled and skilled workers.

In antebellum South Carolina, the largest group of colored slave masters in the city of Charleston worked in the garment business. Many of the mantua makers, seamstresses, shoemakers, and tailors found that slavery provided them with the labor needed to fully exploit the market in clothing. In 1850, the number of colored slaveowners who made garments in Charleston City was reported at 29 masters. The majority of these artisans worked as mantua makers and seamstresses. All of these artisans were female entrepreneurs, and many were either unmarried or widowed and could not depend on the assistance of a spouse. By their own industry, the colored women acquired the capital to purchase slaves. In 1847, Caroline Lubet, a mulatto mantua maker of Charleston City, bought a 26-year-old woman named Elizabeth for $425. Nearly four years later, she purchased a mulatto girl named Louisa from Celeste and James Hillegas for $500. By 1850, Caroline Lubet was reported to be the owner of two black women and an 18-year-old mulatto girl. In fact, her ownership of slaves lasted from 1847 until 1865, when she was forced to emancipate her slaves. 26

Once the colored mantua makers and seamstresses purchased slaves, they usually employed their servants to assist them in the garment trade. The majority of the slaves held by these artisans were adult females. For example, records for one year show that the slaveholders owned 21 adult females and only 5 adult males. Since the garment trade in female clothing required the talents of skilled

women, it was not necessary to purchase adult male slaves.27 The preponderance of female slaves suggests that the slave women were acquired to be used as mantua makers and seamstresses. In 1850, thirteen out of sixteen slaveholding garment makers held adult female slaves whose average age was 26.5 years old. These female slaves were prime workers and purchased to be used as laborers.

Quite often the colored mantua makers and seamstresses held only one prime worker who was employed in the garment trade. In 1860, for example, Mary Ann Gardner, a free mulatto and a seamstress, owned a 30-year-old black woman, the only adult slave held by the colored woman. In that same year, Rebecca Thorne and Sarah H. Weston, who were free persons of color and seamstresses, both owned only one adult slave, who in both cases was a 40-year-old black woman. Undoubtedly these colored women used their slaves to assist them in the clothing business and continued to benefit from the skills of their slaves as late as 1864.2$

Whereas the trades of the mantua makers and the seamstresses were dominated by females, the occupation of tailoring was controlled by males. A few of the colored tailors owned slaves in South Carolina. As early as 1807, Jehu Jones, Sr., a free mulatto and a tailor of Charleston City, started to buy slaves to be used as workers. In 1807, Jones purchased a Negro family, which consisted of Sylvia and her three children, James, Richard, and Mary, for $1,000. When Jehu Jones, Sr., acquired the slave family, he soon began to train the young slave boys in the trade of tailoring and subsequently used them as apprentices. After nearly 16 years, Richard, the slave of Jones and the son of Sylvia, was a mature man and a talented tailor. But Jones apparently no longer needed the services of Richard because he sold the slave tailor to Peter Gowan for $550 in 1823. Although Jones sold the son of Sylvia, he kept his slave woman until he died in the fall of 1833.29 Upon the death of Jehu Jones, Sr., he owned five slaves: Sylvia (elderly), Henry (a boy), Martha, and Martha's children, Allen and Lewis. As requested by his last will and testament, the executors of Jehu Jones, Sr., sold all of his slaves, and the money was divided between his family members.70

It was not unusual for the colored tailors to search the slave market to find a suitable slave to be trained in the skill of tailoring. In 1837, James Drayton Johnson, a free mulatto and a tailor from Charleston City, bought a 19-year-old boy named Billy from Sarah G. Fuller for $650. Johnson subsequently taught the boy the art of making clothes. When Johnson purchased Billy, he made a wise investment because the slave continued to work for him as late as

1850. Not all of his slave purchases were as successful as Billy. In 1835, he bought a boy named Florence to be trained as a tailor. After seven years of apprenticeship and service, he became dissatisfied with the work of Florence and sold the slave boy to Alex H. Brown for $660. Nearly four months after James Drayton Johnson disposed of the slave boy, he purchased a tailor named Tommy from Jacob C. Levy for $250. With the absence of Florence, Johnson needed another skilled worker.

Like Johnson, other colored tailors occasionally purchased slaves who would not submit to their authority and had to be sold. In 1831, Benjamin T. Huger, a free mulatto and a tailor of Charleston City, was compelled to sell his servant Moses when the slave proved to be unmanageable. Yet the occasional sale of a discontented slave did not inhibit the tailors from buying workers, but stimulated them to replace their wayward servants with more suitable laborers."

Many colored tailors found that the success of their businesses depended upon the acquisition of slaves. As the city of Charleston grew, the garment market began to expand. The demand for slave clothes was increasing, and both free blacks and whites added to the growing business provided by the planters. Since most plantations rarely had the facilities to make clothing, the planters often frequented the local tailors and shoemakers of Charleston City. In fact, the order from a single planter entailed clothing to meet the needs of 50 to 75 persons. Clearly, such an order demanded the skills of several workers to make the coarse clothing for the slaves. The tailors also maintained a steady business in clothing for free persons of color, white citizens, urban slaveowners, and nominal slaves. In 1839, for example, John DeLarge, a colored tailor and a slaveowner of Charleston City, had a good deal of business with the Dewee family. In fact, he made $70 worth of clothing for the colored family within two months. As the demand for clothing increased, the more successful tailors eventually purchased between two and four slaves to assist them in making garments.32

During the 1850s, the Weston brothers were among the most successful and wealthy men of color to work as tailors in Charleston City. In 1850, the two brothers owned a total of five slaves and real estate valued at $12,000. In 1842, Jacob and Samuel Weston had decided to combine their resources and purchase a slave to assist them. On January 13, they bought a 16-year-old boy named Henry Devand from Mr. J. Hersman for $700. Prior to the purchase, the two brothers had employed Henry Devand in their shop on 104 Queen Street. After the Weston brothers bought Henry Devand, they

purchased two slaves named Richard Bontham and Harry, who were also employed in their tailor shop. In addition to these artisan-slaves, the Westons bought house servants. In 1840, for example, Jacob Weston purchased a black woman named Clarissa from Harriet Hulbion for $225. Samuel Weston bought four adult female slaves between 1843 and 1860. Apparently he employed one or two of the women to work in the house while the other slaves were hired out to non- slaveowners.13

By the 1850s, the institution of slavery had become an important part of the Westons' life. In fact, the Weston brothers' ownership of slaves spanned more than 20 years and did not end for one brother until his death in March 1864. Upon the death of Jacob Weston, he still held the two slaves Henry Devand and Harry, who were appraised at $500.74 About three years before his death, he requested that "Henry Devand, the servant of myself and [my] brother Samuel Weston [shall] be or [should] be purchased by my brother ... paying a reasonable value for my portion." He further requested that "Richard Bontham, the servant of myself and [my] brother Samuel Weston, shall serve during the stay of my wife in the City of Charleston and upon her leaving he shall have his time with the consent of my brother.... 1131 Jacob Weston also provided for the freedom of his servant Harry upon the departure of his wife to England. After Jacob's death, Samuel Weston continued to use the labor of slaves in the tailor shop on Queen Street until the defeat of the Confederacy forced him to emancipate his slaves.36

In the city of Charleston, the slaveholding tailors of African heritage made up a modest portion of the colored garment makers. For example, 11 out of 57, or 19.3 percent, of the colored tailors owned slaves in 1850. Eleven tailors-William Holmes, Benjamin T. Huger, James Drayton Johnson, James Johnston, John Oliver, George Prince, Edward Roche, Francis Smith, Joseph Terry, Jacob Weston, and Samuel Weston-held a total of 45 slaves, which was an average holding of 4 bondsmen." By 1860 the percentage of colored tailors owning slaves had slightly increased, although the numbers of both slaveowners and slaves had declined. In that year, 10 out of 48, or 20.8 percent, of the colored tailors owned slaves, but the 10 masters held only 37 bondsmen. As the War Between the States intensified, the number of colored tailors who owned slaves continued to decline. In 1863, there were only six colored tailors who owned slaves in Charleston City. Those six-James Johnston, George McKinlay, William McKinlay, Jacob Weston, Samuel Weston, and James Williams-held a total of 21 slaves. Within one year of the defeat of the Confederacy,

six colored tailors continued to own slaves even as the Union Army was approaching the port city. In 1864, James Drayton Johnson, James Johnston, George McKinlay, Charles Walker, and Samuel Weston were the owners of 16 slaves. Among the slaveholding tailors of African descent, the ownership of slaves resulted from the desire to capitalize on the growing market in garments, which could not be exploited without the assistance of laborers. These businessmen simply tapped the most available supply of labor in order to meet their increasing demands."

As the colored shoemakers witnessed an increase in the volume of their trade, they too were compelled to purchase slaves to be employed in their shops. In 1828, John Mishaw, a free mulatto and a shoemaker of Charleston City, purchased a 25-year-old shoemaker named Tom from William Pritchard for $420. As Mishaw drew more and more customers, he searched the slave market for the services of another skilled worker. In 1832, he purchased his second slave, who was also trained as a shoemaker, from Allen Johnson for $200. Within eight years, he acquired a total of five male slaves who were between 10 and 55 years old. These male slaves probably assisted him in the shoe store on 55 Queen Street. The size of his labor force suggests that he received a brisk business from the patrons of Charleston. For the most part, the colored shoemakers were patronized not only by free blacks and urban slave masters, but also by planters. The demand for slave shoes caused many shoemakers to acquire additional laborers. With an order from just a single large planter entailing between 40 and 60 pair of shoes, the services of several skilled workers were necessary. In 1817, William Cooper of Charleston City bought a black slave named David from Peter Labaussay for $700. Undoubtedly, Cooper purchased the slave to be employed in his shoe shop on 46 King Street. Between 1829 and 1840, Malcolm Brown, a mulatto and a bootmaker of Charleston Neck, purchased a total of nine slaves for $4,312.50. Most of the slaves were males and probably employed in Brown's establishment on 45 Anson Street. In 1840, the federal census reported that five of Brown's male slaves were between 10 and 36 years old, while only two females were between 10 and 24 years old. By 1850 Malcolm Brown owned four male slaves who were 47, 40, 38, and 10 years old. Although male workers were used in the shoe store, Brown owned six female slaves whose ages were 51, 32, 27, 16, 16, and 12 years old in 1850. Many of these women were employed as domestic servants and either worked in the household of their master or were hired out. A descendant of Malcolm Brown recalled that the colored slaveowner "owned a number of slaves who treated his girls as any slave would treat his [or her] white mistresses ... [and] referred to

them as Miss Susan, Miss Mary and Miss Sarah." When the slaves of Malcolm Brown became disobedient, he was ready to sell his servants. In 1839, for example, he sold a black woman named Isabella and her two children, Harriet and Charlotte, to Joseph Patton for $1,000. Then four years later, he parted with his slave Deborah, who had been employed by him for nine years. 19

In the antebellum society, free blacks used the labor of slaves in virtually every facet of the southern economy. Even in the food-related services, there were colored persons who used the skills of slaves. Several black women used their expertise in Southern cuisine and catered to the aristocrats of Charleston City, but they needed slaves to assist them. From 1819 to 1824, Sally Seymour used slaves to work in her pastry shop on Tradd Street. Before her death in April 1824, she held two slaves named Felix (a cook) and Jenny whom she employed in her business. Like Sally Seymour, other black women were able to utilize their talents as caterers, confectioners, and cooks, thus earning the money needed to purchase slaves. During the 1820s and the early 1830s, Camillia Jchnson used five slaves named Maria, London, Dianah, Diana, and Phoebe as cooks and attendants in her catering business on King Street. Miss Johnson employed her servants to cater and attend many of the parties held by the socialites of Charleston. Yet Camilla Johnson did not have a monopoly in the catering or the pastry business during the 1830s. In 1830, for example, eight colored persons named Eliza Dwight, Martha Gilchrist, Hannah Hetty, Elizabeth Holton, Mary Holton, Elsey Lee, Cato McCloud, and Betsey Walker worked as caterers and pastry cooks. All of them were slaveowners, and they owned a total of 34 slaves. The majority of the slaves they held were adult females who assisted their owners. By 1850 the number of slaveholding caterers and pastry cooks who were of African heritage had declined to six. These colored slaveholders were Ann Bentham, James Burke, Hannah Francis, Mary Holton, Betsey Walker, and Martha Vanderhorst. According to the census, they held a total of 20 slaves. Like the slaveholders of 1830, they owned primarily adult female slaves. In fact, 12 out of 20 slaves held by the colored slaveowners were adult females, which suggests that they were used as workers in the shops of their owners.40 Even as the Confederate and the Union forces were engaging in combat, there were six colored caterers and pastry cooks (Ann Bentham, Joseph W. Dereef, Robert Hargrave, Emma McCall, Sarah Ann Snowden & Betsey Walker) who owned a total of ten slaves in Charleston City. Undoubtedly, these artisans found a market for their skills and utilized the labor of slaves to assist them.41

Butchers of African heritage also used the labor of slaves. In 1830, John Weston, a colored butcher of Charleston Neck, owned a boy named John who was used as an assistant. After Weston's death, the executors of the deceased man were requested to sell all of the utensils and articles connected with his trade. Unfortunately, the slave boy was included among the items scheduled to be sold. Elsewhere in Charleston Neck, William Friday, Jr., purchased a male slave named York from George Jacobs for $215 in 1832. Seven years later, he bought Lydia for $530. Friday used York to work in the butcher shop on Cannonsboro Street, while Lydia toiled as a domestic servant. When William Friday, Jr., died in 1841, his widow, Alicia Friday, took possession of the slaves and appropriated them for her own benefit.

Many other colored butchers of Charleston City owned slaves. In 1860, for example, 6 out of 22, or 27.2 percent, of the free black butchers held slaves in the port city. These six-Thomas Fanning, Elias Gardner, Joseph A. Sasportas, George Shrewsberry, Francis L. Wilkinson, and James Williams - held a total of 27 slaves. Even as the Emancipation Proclamation was being written by President Abraham Lincoln, there were five colored butchers who owned 23 slaves.42

Many colored artisans believed that the success of their trades depended on the acquisition of slaves. It was therefore not unusual for caterers and pastry cooks as well as butchers to purchase slaves to be used in their businesses.

In fact, the colored artisans who were the most successful entrepreneurs used the labor of slaves. In Charleston City, for example, the majority of the well-to-do colored barbers purchased slaves to be employed in their shops and as capital investments to be sold when the market was most profitable. In 1820, Thomas Inglis was one of the wealthiest colored persons in the port city. He not only owned and managed a barbershop on Meeting Street, but also held several slaves, according to the federal censuses of 1820 and 1830. In 1812, Inglis bought a slave named David Gray from Claudia Smith for $300. (After the acquisition of Gray, he recorded three bills of sale for the purchasing of four more slaves, valued at $1,775.) For more than twenty years, David Gray worked in the barbershop of his master. To reward the diligence of his faithful servant, Thomas Inglis requested that "my Executrix and Children ... treat him [David Gray) kindly and do permit him to hire himself out, as he may request ... so as to enable him to live comfortably ..."4' Even though David Gray may have been treated kindly, he was still a slave and subject to the whims of his master.

In spite of the occasional kindness of Thomas Inglis, he was a slaveowner for profit, and his emotions did not influence him when dealing in human chattel. When the market was favorable for the sale of a healthy slave, he was quite willing to part with his property for the right price. In 1817, for example, Thomas Inglis sold a 22-year-old slave named Alex for $1,000. Six years later, he disposed of a slave family consisting of a black woman named Mary and her two children, Mary and Peter, for $650. And in 1830, he sold Lindy, who had worked as a domestic servant in his household for nearly nine years, to Elizabeth Snipes for $450.44 Clearly slavery was a harsh business and the motive of profit ruled the hearts of slave masters regardless of race.

When Thomas Inglis died in 1835, he owned an estate more valuable than many planters would have dreamed of possessing. His property was appraised at $36,662. Among the possessions recorded in the inventory of the deceased colored man were ten slaves named Abby, Rose, Sonis, George, James, Bella, Nancy, Charlotte, Alex, and March, who were appraised at $3,750. In addition to slaves, he owned four houses valued at $11,700 as well as stocks and bonds appraised at $19,303. As the wealth of Inglis had grown, he had purchased slaves to work in his barbershop, and the profits from slavery had been invested in added slaves, real estate, stocks, and bonds."

Before the death of Thomas Inglis, he provided his loved ones with slave property. In his will, he stated:

> I give to my beloved Wife Martha Sophia Inglis two servants to be selected by her from such of them as I may die possessed of and in like manner to each of my children two servants to be selected by my said Executrix ... 46

Like many slaveowners, Thomas Inglis was aware of the usefulness of slaves and gave his family members such property. Upon his death, he was the wealthiest and the largest slaveowner among the colored barbers in South Carolina.

Most of the colored barbers who owned slaves were the masters of one or two servants, often needing no more than that to meet the demands of their trade. In 1830, for example, Moses Brown of Charleston City was reported to be the owner of two slaves. In that year, he held a servant woman and a male slave. Moses Brown purchased his male servant (also named Moses) from Mary Warhaim for $300 in 1822. Shortly after the sale, he put the slave to work in his barbershop on 5 Tradd Street. The son of Moses Brown followed in his

father's footsteps and used the labor of slaves. In 1840, Peter Brown acquired two male slaves to work as barbers. His ownership of slaves spanned more than 20 years. In 1850, he was reported as the owner of a 21-year-old male slave. By 1860 his male servant was still employed in the barbershop on 3 Elliot Street .41

A few of the colored barbers were willing to purchase young slaves to be trained and later used as skilled workers in their shops. In 1848, for example, William Inglis, Jr., purchased two colored boys named John (10 years old) and James (5 years old) from Otis J. Chafee for $420. Inglis probably used the 10-year-old slave to sweep the floor of his shop and to perform other menial jobs. When the boy was unoccupied, he was instructed in the trade of cutting hair. In 1850, William Inglis, Jr., still kept his young slaves and employed them in his barbershop on 4 Queen Street. A colored competitor of Inglis also used two young slaves to work in his barbershop on Anson Street. Robert Moultrie, a 27-year-old mulatto, utilized the labor of two male slaves whose ages were 20 and 10 years old. Undoubtedly, the 20-year-old slave was employed by his master as a barber, while the 10-year-old boy performed the menial chores in the barbershop.48 On 33 State Street, Peter Nelson, a mulatto and a barber, used three male slaves who were 20, 19, and 10 years old. Although several of the slaves owned by the colored barbers were quite young, they were capable of working and eventually were used as barbers.49

In 1850, 7 out of 23, or 26 percent of Charleston's Negro barbers (Peter Brown, Frederick Campbell, John L. Francis, William Inglis, Jr., Edward Lee, Robert Moultrie, and Peter Nelson) held a total of 19 slaves, of whom 11 were males.S° By 1860, only 3 out of 20, or 15 percent, of the colored barbers owned slaves in Charleston City-Peter Brown, John L. Francis, and Francis St. Mark. The three colored men held eleven slaves between them. At the outbreak of the Civil War, the colored barbers maintained their ownership of slaves. As late as 1864, only one of the three barbers, Francis St. Mark, had divested himself of his slaves. Apparently he either found someone to purchase his slaves or simply emancipated his servants, because he was no longer recorded as a slaveowner. During the 1860s, the city of Charleston was still the mecca for the black slaveowner -even as the Civil War raged closer to the shores of the port city."

Not all of the colored barbers who owned slaves lived in Charleston City. In 1850, Edward Rainey, the father of Congressman Joseph Rainey of South Carolina, owned an 18-year-old black male who was probably used in his barbershop situated in Georgetown City. By 1860 Rainey had acquired a 40-year-old black man to work in the

barbershop. Elsewhere in South Carolina, Benjamin Roberts of Anderson County used the proceeds from his barbershop to purchase two female slaves, who may have been employed as domestic servants or hired outs:

A few colored artisans made such a handsome profit from their trades and the use of slavery that they made other investments which required workers. In 1816, Jehu Jones, Sr., a free colored person and a tailor by trade, used the revenue from his business to purchase the Burrows-Hall Inn for $13,000. Soon thereafter he referred to the building as the Jones Inn. Once Jones was ready for business, he catered to many of the travelers who made an extended visit to the city."

Many of the guests were impressed by the pleasant atmosphere Jones provided. In 1832, Thomas Hamilton, the English traveler, came to Charleston and stayed in the Jones Inn. He suggested that

> Every English who visits Charleston will, if he be wise, direct his baggage to Jones's Hotel. It is a small house, but everything is well managed, and the apartments are good. Our party at dinner did not exceed ten, and there was no bolting or scrambling ... The pleasure of ... revisiting the glimpses of clean table clothes and silver-of exchanging salt pork and greasy corn cake, for a table furnished with luxuries of all sorts - was very great. For a day or two, I experienced a certain impulse to voracity, by no means philosophical; and sooth to say, after the privations of a journey from New Orleans, the luxury of Jones's iced claret might have converted even Diogenes into a gourmet."

Such a well-managed inn could not have been maintained without the aid of an assortment of helpers. Jones used the services of butlers, cooks, maids, and other servants to keep the hotel running in an orderly fashion. The workers used by Jones were not free laborers, but slaves. According to the fourth federal census, he owned six slaves." With that kind of manpower at his disposal, it is only natural to suspect that he used the slaves as laborers in his hotel.

When Jehu Jones, Sr., died in 1833, he presented his stepdaughter with the hotel. Under the management of Ann Deas, the Jones Inn was frequented by many of the old clients as well as by new visitors. Like her stepfather, Deas used slaves to maintain the high standards of the Jones Inn. In 1840, for example, she owned five

female slaves who were between 10 and 36 years of age and undoubtedly worked in the hotel. In fact, the Jones Inn served as a training school for aspiring cooks. Usually, the owner of the hotel apprenticed slaves to be taught the art of Southern cuisine. In August 1844, the Charleston Courier ran the following advertisement:

> At private sale a first rate man cook, taught at the hotel of Jehu Jones, and has cooked for years for one of the first families of this State ...ss

The slaves of Ann Deas played an important part in the success of the Jones Inn. They not only cooked the delicacies fit for royalty but tended to the needs of her clientele and made a pleasant setting for visitors.

The Jones Inn suffered financial difficulties during the middle part of the 1840s, and Ann Deas was forced to relinquish her control over the hotel. In 1847, John Lee and his wife, Eliza Seymour Lee, rented the Jones Inn. Prior to the lease, they operated Lee's Boarding House, which was located a short distance from the Jones Inn on 65 Broad Street. Under the care of Eliza Seymour Lee, the daughter of the renowned cook Sally Seymour, the boarding house provided some of the finest meals in Charleston. In fact, the food prepared by Mrs. Lee was so delicious that visitors to the boarding house often requested her to instruct their slaves in her style of cooking." Occasionally she obliged them. In 1841, Eliza Seymour Lee instructed the slave of Nathaniel Heyward, Jr., a planter of Beaufort District, in the art of Southern cuisine. Yet John and Eliza Lee not only apprenticed slaves, but also owned servants to be employed in their boarding house. In 1839, John Lee purchased a black man named George from Sarah Ralston for $1,000. Nearly one year later, he bought Edwin for $700. With the assistance of slaves, the Lees were spared from performing the mundane chores of the boarding house business. Yet their experience as the owners of Lee's Boarding House prepared them to expand their horizons and manage the Jones Inn.5'

On October 17, 1847, John and Eliza Lee were ready to open the doors of the Jones Inn and conduct business. In an advertisement placed in the Charleston Mercury, John Lee informed the public of the reopening of the inn.

> to be re-opened ... that long established and popular House known as Jones's Hotel, Broad street opposite City Square and one of the most central and pleasant situations in the city.

The premises have undergone a thorough repair, and many important improvements have been made. The furniture is neat and genteel and the bedding in complete order. The subscriber who has had long experience in catering for his friends and the public pledges himself to make every exertion in his power in rendering Jones Hotel as desirable a residence for ladies and gentlemen as can be found in any hotel or private boarding house of Charleston.

John Lee Former Proprietor of Lee's House"

Within three years after the grand reopening of the Jones Inn, the proprietors catered to citizens from both the northern and southern parts of the nation. On August 9, 1850, the inn received the following visitors: Edward Gamage, a merchant from New York and his wife, Esther Gamage; Isaac Ball, a planter from South Carolina and his brother, Alvin Ball; and Richard Cogdell of South Carolina.60

In order to maintain a pleasant setting for the visitors to the Jones Inn, John and Eliza Lee owned 8 slaves, whose ages were between 13 and 36 years old, to tend the needs of their clientele.61

In another section of the city, William W. Seymour, the brother of Eliza Seymour Lee, managed a tavern on Pond Point. Seymour's establishment was much smaller than his brother-in-law's inn, but it served a similar purpose. The taverns of Charleston City were gathering places serving meals and beverages as well as providing weary travelers with lodging. In spite of the small size of Seymour's tavern, he still needed the services of barmaids, cooks, and servants to clean the various rooms. In 1842, these jobs were performed by his slaves. In that year, he owned the following slaves: Charlotte, 55 years old; Jim, 45 years old; Sally, 20 years old; Samuel, 15 years old; Frank, 13 years old; Isaac, 11 years old; and the children of Sally named Thomas, 3 years old, and Allen, 6 months old. William W. Seymour continued to use the labor of slaves to maintain the standards of the tavern until his death in 1862. Shortly later, the administrators of the deceased colored man's estate sold his slaves for $3,080.62

Many of the free blacks who purchased slaves were not artisans. In the Palmetto State, there were colored men and women who managed businesses which did not require specialized training. These enterprising free blacks catered to the basic needs of their society and performed such services as hauling material, keeping stables, and selling wood.

As the clientele of these colored entrepreneurs grew, they too found the need to purchase slaves to be used as workers in their businesses. During the early 1800s, Joseph Morton, a free black of Charleston City, conducted a thriving business as a drayman. Morton hauled all sorts of items and merchandise throughout the city. By 1810 his business had grown to the extent that he required the services of four drays (carts) and four horses. To drive his carts, he used the labor of two slaves named James and Jack. The profits from draying allowed him to purchase not only two dray drivers, but also a washerwoman and two male servants.

Although most of the draymen made enough money to support themselves, only a few men, like Joseph Morton, were able to extract a handsome profit from their services and purchase slaves. In 1820, Simon Groning, a free black of Charleston City, bought a 30-year-old slave named Carlos for $300. Groning probably employed the slave as a dray driver. Elsewhere in the city, Carlos Smith, a free black and a dray driver, purchased a 31-year-old slave named James for $455 in 1825. Between 1820 and 1826, Carlos Smith bought nine slaves - James, Doll, Chloe, Little James, Caty, and Caty's children, Mary, Margaret, Charles, and Annfor a total sum of $2,245.63

As the colored draymen prospered, they did not always purchase male slaves to be used as dray drivers; sometimes they bought the services of domestic slaves. For example, Dick Wragg, a free black of Charleston City, owned a female servant named Mira. In his will, he requested that "my Wrench Mira and my Dray and Horse shall be sold and the monies arising thereform be applied towards paying all my just debts and funeral charges. "64

Throughout the antebellum period, the number of colored draymen who owned slaves was quite small. In 1850, for example, 3 out of 22 colored dray drivers owned slaves in Charleston City. In that year, the draymen Robert Cattel, Jerry Fergusson, and Hamlet Murley held a total of 21 slaves.61 By 1861, Peter Desverneys was the last drayman of African descent to own slaves in South Carolina. According to his inventory, he owned three slaves named Adeline, John, and Rebecca. The death of Peter Desverneys in 1861 ended the line of colored draymen who owned slaves.66

During the antebellum era, the black stablekeepers of South Carolina also used the labor of slaves. On 7 Chalmer Street in Charleston City, Jack Gardner managed a stable. With the assistance of two male slaves, he kept the horses groomed and the stables clean. In 1840, Isaac Mathews owned the Mathews Livery Stable on 94

Board Street. Mathews used the services of five males to work in the establishment. After his death in 1850, his son Henry Mathews managed the business and used the slaves belonging to the estate of Isaac Mathews to assist him. A short distance from the Mathews Livery Stable, Jacob Green and his sister Mary Green also ran a stable. They used the services of two male slaves, whose ages were 25 and 35 years old, to work as attendants in the stable. Not all of the stable keepers lived in Charleston City. In 1850, Jesse Rabb, a free mulatto of Columbia City, operated a stable and used the services of a 32-year-old black male to work in the establishment. 61

Among the woodsellers of Charleston City, there were a few colored slaveowners. The wood dealers who purchased slaves used their services to gather and haul wood to be sold. Often the wood was purchased by residents, steamboat captains, and factory owners of Charleston City for fuel.

From 1841 until 1865, Robert Howard, a free mulatto, used the services of slaves in his woodselling business. In 1841, Howard purchased a 22-year-old black slave named William from Edwin R. Dorrill for $550. Four years later, he bought Julius for $500. Using the labor of the two slaves, he began to haul wood into the city and sell it to numerous customers. In July 1852, for example, Howard sold his wood to Mrs. Elizabeth Holloway for $13. Even though Robert Howard was able to supply many of the citizens of Charleston City with wood, he required the services of slaves to accomplish his task. Yet he not only used the labor of slaves in the woodselling business, but also held four adult females who were probably hired out.6' With the revenue made from selling wood and hiring out slaves, Howard diversified his investments by purchasing houses to be rented out. By 1860 he had accumulated an estate valued at $37,100, which included five slaves (two males and three females) as well as 18 houses. Robert Howard appears to have been committed to slavery, as he continued his ownership of slaves into 1861, 1862, 1863, and 1864. Indeed, he did not relinquish his human property until the defeat of the Confederacy forced him to free his servants. However, Robert Howard was not the only black man who used the labor of slaves in the woodselling business.69

During the turmoil of the early 1860s, R.H. Harney and William Rollins were colored wood dealers who owned slaves in Charleston City. In 1862, the two wood dealers held a total of four slaves. One suspects that they used the bondsmen as laborers in the woodselling business. Without slaves, it would have been difficult for them to compete with the slaveowning woodsellers who had the access to

several laborers. And so they submitted to the pressures from competitors and purchased slaves to be used as laborers.70

Not all of the slaveowning artisans purchased slaves to employ in their shops or businesses. Some purchased bondsmen to be hired out. In many instances, the artisans of African ancestry who owned slaves made arrangements with non-slaveowners who wished to hire their servants. The two parties would negotiate the price for the labor of the slave and the period of service. Usually the hired out slave worked from January until Christmas, and once the engagement was completed, a new contract was established by the two parties.

In Charleston City, colored artisans found an eager market for the labor of slaves. Nearly every month, the local newspapers ran advertise ments for the services of slaves. In August of 1852, the Charleston Courier ran the following notice: "wanted immediately, a boy, from 14 to 19 years of age, to do house work." Many of the advertisements in the newspapers were for domestic servants because many urban families chose not to buy house slaves, preferring to hire them. In 1848, the city officials reported that 71.6 percent of the slaves from Charleston City were employed as domestic servants, and the majority of the house slaves were females. Many colored artisans, aware of the demand for domestic servants, purchased slaves to be hired out as house slaves. These black entrepreneurs, hoping for profits bought as many slaves as possible to be used as business ventures. For example, between 1840 and 1846, George Shrewsberry, a free mulatto and a butcher by trade, bought 16 slaves named Diana, William, Louisa, Grace, Frank, Ellen, Liddy, Sarah, Sabina, Cyrus, Jacob, Isaac, David, Nat, Lewis, and Richard for $4,608.01. Once the slaves were purchased, he hired out his servants. Another colored butcher, Francis L. Wilkinson, owned four women named Betty, Mary, Tillah, and Charlotte who were hired out. As late as 1864, his wife, Selina Wilkinson, collected from his slaves wages for one month, which came to $16."

Colored artisans who owned several slaves usually engaged their servants as hired out workers and kept the money earned by the labor of their slaves. In 1850, for example, Martha Vanderhorst, a 38-year-old mulatto and a pastry cook, owned 7 slaves, whose ages were 12, 14, 14, 15, 16, 16, and 17 years. She could not have used all seven slaves in her pastry store on 53 King Street, so she undoubtedly hired the surplus workers to non-slaveowners.72

For the most part, the colored women of Charleston City were the primary suppliers of hired out slaves within the free black

community. Often times, these women were widows or spinsters and lived off the income of hired slaves. Between 1845 and 1861, Elizabeth Holloway, the former wife of Robert Collins, Jr., hired out the slaves of her deceased husband. Upon the death of her spouse, she inherited the following slaves: Katy, Bella, John (35 years old), Jenny (12 years old), Peggy (10 years old), Cecila (8 years old), and Ansel (4 years old). In order to support herself as well as two little ones named Martha and Sarah Collins, she hired out her slaves. From April 1846 to March 1847, Elizabeth Holloway received the wages of John and Jenny. For that year, her male slave earned $96, while her young female made $36. With a total of $132 provided by her slaves, Elizabeth Holloway supported her family." In October 1846, for example, Elizabeth Holloway bought clothing for her two daughters which cost $40. Mrs. Holloway used the wages of her slaves not only to feed and clothe her children, but also to educate them. In 1848, she sent her daughter Sarah Collins to one of the local schools for free blacks in Charleston City and paid $12 for tuition. By 1850, both Sarah and Martha Collins were attending a private school which cost their mother the sum of $24. Within two years, the colored girls were sent to a boarding school, and their mother paid $150 for the facilities. From 1853 to 1860, the annual cost of educating her daughters ranged between $159.19 and $192. With the money provided by her slaves, Mrs. Holloway easily paid the costs of educating her children. In 1853, for example, the expenses incurred for the education of her daughters came to $159.19; however, the revenue received from the wages of her slaves (John, Peggy, and Jenny) amounted to $232, which left a balance of $72.81. Clearly, Elizabeth Holloway made enough to support herself and her children by the wages of hired-out slaves."

Mary colored women like Elizabeth Holloway used their slaves as hired-out laborers. In Charleston City, the majority of the colored slaveowners were women, and many of them did not have a spouse or a trade to support themselves. The only assets by which they could sustain themselves were slaves. In 1850, for example, Sarah Lincoln, a 25-year-old mulatto, owned two black females who were 15 and 25 years old. Since she was reported with no spouse or occupation, her only means of support was the revenue made by her hired-out slaves."

In many instances, free blacks purchased young slaves who could not immediately be used as hired-out laborers. In 1842, Mary Ann McCall, a 22-year-old mulatto, purchased an 8-year-old black girl for the purpose of hiring out the child when she was a few years older. In 1816, Francoise Perrier, a free mulatto and a native of Santo

Domingo, purchased a 5-year-old girl named Clementine. For more than 40 years, Perrier used the services of Clementine and later her son James as hired-out workers.76 In her will, she requested that "my daughters Pamela and Adella ... (should have] my servant Woman Clementine and her issue and my Servant boy James to have and to hold the said negroes for their own use and benefit .1177 Like many enterprising slaveowners, the colored women who owned slaves were aware of the benefits to be derived from slavery and used the labor of their slaves to support themselves.

Some colored persons even provided their relatives and friends with the wages of hired-out slaves. In 1850, Jubah Warren, a free black woman of Charleston Neck, provided the wages of nine slaves to her loved ones. According to Jubah Warren's will, Elizabeth Melrose Whiting was to receive the wages of all her slaves until the money amounted to $600 for the purpose of buying a maid for her dear friend. Within six months, the wages of the slaves named Pleasant, Emma, Patty, Stephen, Rachel, Susannah, Sylvia, Pinda, and Monday amounted to $202. After Whiting purchased the maid, the wages were given to the sisters of Jubah Warren." In another example, Henrietta McNeil, a free mulatto of Charleston City, recorded a document in which her great-grandchildren were provided with the wages of a 25-year-old slave.79

Generally, the free black artisans who owned successful businesses became slavemasters because the demand for their services urged them to seek the most available supply of labor. Their use of slaves in their businesses soon extended into speculation in human chattel and the purchase of slaves to be used as domestics or hired out to non-slaveowners. When the colored artisans utilized the services of slaves, they became committed to the institution of slavery, and their use of bondsmen developed into a way of life.

Chapter Nine

The Denmark Vesey Conspiracy: Brown Masters *vs.* Black Slaves

The Denmark Vesey Conspiracy has been explored by countless scholars and writers, but few have linked the failure of the plot with the division between the colored elite and the black masses. Afro-American Charleston during the nineteenth century was a tale of two cities: one made up of affluent persons of color who shared a direct interest in preserving the institution of slavery, the other containing poor members of the free black community and the vast number of slaves. By 1820 the disparity between the elite of Charleston's colored society and the slaves created an unbridgeable schism which doomed the revolution of Denmark Vesey.

As the white slaveowners of Charleston City went about their daily routines, a free black man named Denmark Vesey prepared to unleash the fury of the slaves and destroy the slaveowning inhabitants of the port city, and any others who opposed the rebels. During the period from 1818 to 1822, Vesey charted the conquest of Charleston City. He determined that success of the revolution depended on the capture of the guardhouse and the arsenal in the city. Equally important was the taking of the guardhouse and the arsenal of Charleston Neck. After those initial victories, Denmark Vesey and his supporters would hold the arsenals until the black people of the countryside reached the city. Then guns would be handed out and the rebels would sack the city, killing all of the whites regardless of age or sex. This plan was more complex than implied by the brief description.'

Vesey's scheme, nearly five years in its development, required the loyalty of hundreds of black folk. Vesey elicited the support of city slaves as well as country slaves. Among the lieutenants of the rebellion were house servants and skilled laborers. Ned and Rolla Bennett, for example, were the house slaves of Governor Thomas Bennett. Ned was selected to lead a company of slaves and storm the arsenal of Charleston Neck. From the privileged ranks of the slave society, he recruited bondsmen who were apprenticed to the butchers of the port city. With the assistance of slave butchers, the rebels would be supplied with horses taken from their masters' shops. Other horses would be provided by the blacks who worked in the private and the public livery stables. The rebels would then have a cavalry, led by the slave William Garner, whose function was to scatter the fleeing whites

when the bloodshed occurred. Other key men were Gullah Jack, Peter Poyas, and Monday Gell. Gullah, a harness maker, was assigned the task of capturing Duquercon's store, while Monday, of the Ebo tribe, recruited a group of his kinsmen from the country to attack the white inhabitants of Charleston City. From James Island, Mingo, a country slave, organized an army of 4,000 men to be deployed on the South Bay and subsequently marched into the town. By the summer of 1822, the conspiracy involved the confidence of numerous slaves throughout the area.

Maintaining the commitment of the black insurrectionists was not easy for Denmark Vesey. Many slaves were hesitant about taking up arms and killing not only their masters but all of the whites in the city. One candidate recruited by Rolla Bennett could not fathom the thought of murdering his master. He advised the slave rebel "to let it alone, and told him I would oppose them if they came to kill my owner." As the revolution gradually reached the appointed date, Rolla himself began to vacillate about the killing. He recalled, "my heart pained me within, and I said to myself, I cannot kill my master and mistress, for they use me, more like a son, than a slave-I then concluded in my mind, that I would go into the country, on Saturday evening, before they were to commence on Sunday, that I might not see it." As other slaves questioned the killing of kind masters, Denmark Vesey read the Bible to his recruits and justified the taking of life. At one meeting on Bull Street, he spoke of the bondage of the Israelites and how the Lord had delivered the children of Israel. It was the righteousness of God, Vesey said, which destroyed the armies of Pharaoh when the "chosen people" were denied their freedom. This black Moses of Charleston declared that God was on the side of the slaves of Pharaoh, and the judgment of the Lord would deliver black people from the chains of slavery. As for the killing, he read Joshua 6:21, in which the Israelites, at the Lord's command, destroyed "all that was in the city, both man and woman, young and old, and ox, and sheep, and ass, with the edge of the sword.'" Vesey concluded "it was no sin for us to do so, for the Lord had commanded us to do it."4 With religious zeal, he convinced most of his men of the righteousness of their cause and of the notion that liberation could be achieved only by the divine sword of God.

Vesey also encountered difficulty in recruiting new followers. Being a free man of color, Vesey traveled through the dark corridors of Charleston Neck, into the business district of Charleston City, and even into the rural setting of James Island. As he encountered prospective candidates, this charismatic black man challenged

bondsmen to seize their freedom. One day at the marketplace, he asked a slave whether he was satisfied as a servant. Vesey deplored the slave's acceptance of servitude and told him the fable of Hercules and the wagoner whose cart was stalled. As the wagoner prayed to God, "Hercules said, `you fool, put your shoulders to the wheel, whip the horses and your wagon will be pulled out...'" Vesey concluded that 'if we did not put our hand to work and deliver ourselves, we should never come out of slavery.'" Even as Vesey walked the streets, if a slave bowed to a white man, he rebuked the bonds man and observed "that all men were born equal, and that he was surprised that anyone would degrade himself by such conduct, that he would never cringe to the whites .... "6 When the Missouri Compromise Crisis was printed in the newspapers, Vesey regularly monitored the debates. When the existence of slavery was questioned in the West, he knew that the death of the peculiar institution was within sight. But Vesey was concerned about the immediate future. During his search for discontented slaves, he often told the bondsmen that Congress had emancipated the slaves, but Southern whites refused to obey the law. To soothe the doubts of new recruits, he told them about the successful revolution in Santo Domingo. And when the insurrection commenced, he said, a large army from Santo Domingo and Africa would aid their quest for freedom. With the reopening of the slave trade in 1804, there were hundreds of African-born slaves in the low country. Vesey elicited the help of Gullah Jack to spread the message of revolution to the community of African slaves.7 Gullah Jack was born in Angola and practiced mysticism. As a conjurer, he drew upon the traditions of Africa and enticed slaves to join the cause by providing a potion which protected the rebels from harm. Thus, using an assortment of persuasive techniques, Denmark Vesey induced both rural and urban slaves to commit themselves to the revolution.

Many slaveowners of Charleston believed that their slaves were incapable of rebelling because they were good masters. But Denmark Vesey looked through the placid exterior of the so-called contented slave and saw the unquenched desire for freedom. Even the most fortunate house slave with a benevolent master was property. For example, Ned and Rolla Bennett were treated kindly by Governor Bennett, but still they were chattel and could not control their destiny. Their children could be sold, or the masters of their wives could leave Charleston City, separating Ned and Rolla from family members. Like the Bennetts, most urban slaves of the port city knew their fate depended upon the whims of white slaveowners. They could be sold to the rice planters of Georgetown District and denied the comfort of loved ones and friends. Often the fear of being sold into the country

prompted city slaves to flee from their masters. During the antebellum period, the newspapers of South Carolina printed numerous runaway notices. For example, upon the death of Mary Baker, the slave woman Martilla could not stand the prospect of leaving the city and working on a plantation on Johns Island; so the 23-year-old woman escaped from her new owner and sought refuge in Charleston, reported the South Carolina Gazette. The most faithful servant of a white owner was aware that if his or her master did not emancipate him or her, the auction block was next when the master died. Furthermore, even the benevolent master occasionally was confronted with serious debts which warranted the selling of family members. The sanctity of the slave family, then, was never secure. Denmark Vesey understood the nature of slavery and did not let his supporters or candidates forget that they were not the controllers of their lives, but mere chattel. Freedom of the black masses of Charleston City could be achieved by revolution and nothing else."

For the rural slaves of Charleston District, there was a burning desire for freedom. The slaves who worked in the rice fields of the low country knew the cruelness of slavery which few urban slaves experienced. From sunup until sundown, they worked in the muddy waters of the rice fields. If the work fell behind schedule, the whip was administered on most plantations. Liberty for the field slave was not a philosophical concept, but the escape from forced labor induced by the whip. Many rural slaves perceived Denmark Vesey's call to arms as the only way freedom could be obtained in South Carolina.9

Restrictions on the privilege of private emancipation strengthened Vesey's argument. In 1800, the state legislature had declared that only slaves of good character who were capable of earning a living should be freed. Twenty years later, the assembly completely banned the emancipation of slaves by private citizens, placing that power in the hands of the legislators. If freedom were to be obtained, the slave master must petition the state government in Columbia and hope the assemblymen would feel the request was justified. However, the state legislators believed that manumission should be granted only when the slave performed a herculean task, such as saving the life of a master. The typical slave was doomed to servitude until death.

Even before 1800, emancipation by benevolent masters was beyond the grasp of the majority of the slaves. Few masters emancipated their slaves in South Carolina. Unlike George Washington, whose deathbed will freed his plantation slaves, the majority of the masters gave their bondsmen to relatives. Others

requested that their slave property be auctioned to the highest bidder and the proceeds given to their heirs. Often the sale separated husband from wife and mother from child. Even if the slave was manumitted outside South Carolina, he or she could not return to the state as a free person. Permanent banishment into the North entailed the severing of kinship ties because emancipation did not include complete family units. Usually the slave freed by one master was married to a slave owned by a different master. Thus, one spouse was free while the other remained in bondage. The dream of legal freedom was beyond the reach of the majority of the slaves in South Carolina. 10 Since emancipation was impossible, many slaves concluded that the only chance for freedom was to join the slave insurrection led by Denmark Vesey.

The hopes of the black insurrectionists hinged on the carelessness of Charlestonians. By 1820 the city was a calm and placid place. Few masters had learned their lessons from previous slave rebellions. In 1739, slaves on the Stono River had killed two guards at the warehouse and approached the arsenal. As they descended on the town, the slaves plundered and burned everything in their path. By the time the revolt was suppressed, twenty whites had died and several buildings had been burned to the ground. If the Stono Rebellion was too far in the past to remind the slaveowners of their vulnerability, the Gabriel Prosser Conspiracy should have taught the masters of Charleston an important lesson. In the spring of 1800, Gabriel had planned to march an army of slaves into Richmond and take the city's arsenal. But twenty years after the conspiracy in Virginia, the authorities of Charleston were slack in their duties. Even the city patrol sleepily went through the byways with only an old gun and seldom enforced the curfew against slaves traveling the streets after dark. The guard also turned his back to the slaves who frequented the shops where liquor was sold. The stables were seldom guarded, and the arsenal commanded only one man. Vesey knew his band of followers could easily avoid the patrol and take the arsenal with little difficulty. By the time the white residents of Charleston realized what was happening, the country slaves would have entered the city and sealed the fate of all the whites. As long as the officials remained unaware and trusted their false security, Denmark Vesey was convinced that victory could be won. I I

As the day of the insurrection approached, black Charleston was a divided community. Discord between the free colored elite and the mass of black slaves created two distinctly different societies with little social interaction. Many of the elite members of the Afro-

American community wanted nothing to do with slaves, apart from owning them. The majority of the colored elite did own slaves at one time, regarding slave ownership as a privilege and a status symbol. Ownership of slaves by free Negroes created a wedge which separated the free class from the slaves.

As the community of free Negroes grew, the disparities between free persons and slaves became quite apparent. Since dark skin was associated with slavery, the free Negro elite formed societies which extolled light skin and looked down on dark-skinned people. Many in the elite society of Afro-Americans did not socialize with free people of dark complexion. By 1790, Charleston was divided not only by lines of free and slave status, but by a self-imposed color line separating mulattoes from blacks. Even the mulatto and the black communities were divided between the rich and the poor. When Denmark Vesey was organizing the insurrection, the fragmentation of the Afro-American community was a very dangerous problem which was eventually to destroy the rebellion.

Not all black masters held slaves for commercial purposes. Some free blacks purchased family members and friends but neglected or were unable to manumit them. However, whether their motives were commercial or benevolent, black masters were viewed as a threat to the slave insurrection planned by Denmark Vesey because elite free Negroes had close relationships with white Charlestonians. During the early 1820s, many of the Negro elite were former slaves who had obtained their freedom by merit. Few hated their former owners; rather, they had grown to respect the men and women who had held them as property. Some were related to their former masters by ties of kinship. More importantly, they conducted business with white Charlestonians. Their livelihood depended on the patronage of the Southern gentry and other white citizens; therefore they were amicable to white people. For the Negro elite, taking part in a slave insurrection was unthinkable. Even the black masters who did not cast their lot with white masters could not support a slave rebellion because they had so much to lose and nothing to gain.

Once freed from bondage, most of the Negro elite seemed to demonstrate a fondness towards their former masters. Between 1790 and 1800, George Mathews, the slave of Martha Ann Mathews, was granted his freedom by his owner. Even though he had spent much of his life as a slave, he showed no animosity towards his mistress. After all, she had been a good owner and had treated him with compassion. As a free man, he was indebted to the benevolence of his former mistress and respected her. In fact, George Mathews asked his former

mistress to serve as the executor of his estate and to look after his family when death claimed his soul. Clearly, he trusted his former owner and viewed her as an important ally.

Other members of the Negro elite indicated both respect and fondness for their former masters by keeping the surname of the white people who had held them as chattel.' 2 After Sam Cochran was emancipated from bondage, he chose to keep the last name of his former mistress. In another example, Fanny Graham retained the surname of her young mistress when she was freed. Undoubtedly, both Sam Cochran and Fanny Graham saw the usefulness of a close relationship with their former owners and sought to maintain the linkage. By keeping the surname of their former masters, they proclaimed to the white community what families had owned them. Their former owners, in turn, viewed them as honest and respectable people who had earned their freedom and the patronage of white Charlestonians."

For the children of white men and black women, the relationship to whites was even closer. When the products of miscegenation were freed from the stigma of slavery, few sought to escape the influence of their white fathers or wanted to destroy the white people of Charleston. In many instances, they were provided with land or slaves by their white fathers. For example, Isaac and Henry Glencamp (the mulatto sons of Henry Glencamp, a white planter of St. Stephens Parish) were provided with land and slaves by their white father. In the neighboring parish of St. Thomas & St. Dennis, the mulatto sons of Robert Collins were given 540 acres of land as well as slaves. With land and slaves, the mulatto offspring of white planters followed their fathers' footsteps and became cotton and rice planters. Unlike many of the black farmers, who worked the soil with their own hands, the mulatto planters used the labor of slaves to till the soil and gather the harvest. Without question, the mulatto sons of white planters who were given land and slaves had a direct interest in the peculiar institution. Furthermore, being the offspring of well-to-do whites, they benefitted from the friendships established by their fathers with other planters. Their rights as free mulattoes were protected by the neighbors and friends of their fathers."

In antebellum Charleston, a network of personal relationships developed between the Negro elite and white persons. Often the face-toface, person-to-person contacts permitted Southern whites to see members of the Negro elite as men and women. However, these interactions seldom went beyond a form of paternalism which existed between master and slave. The personal relationships did not

eliminate the Southern etiquette which separated whites from blacks. Despite their wealth and respectability, the Negro elite were still Negroes-but a better class of Negroes, according to their white neighbors and allies. In any case, the relationships afforded the Negro elite with the protection provided by influential whites who could ensure their freedom."

Whenever possible, the Negro elite cultivated their relationships with the white aristocracy. When black Charlestonians were withdrawing from the white-controlled Methodist Church, the Negro elite continued to join churches dominated by white congregations. Indeed, the most influential members of colored society attended St. Philip's Episcopal Church of Charleston City. For example, Thomas Bonneau, a free mulatto and a schoolteacher, was a member of St. Philip's. Shortly after purchasing the freedom of his wife and daughter, he had two-year-old Henrietta Potts Bonneau baptized in the church. In fact, St. Philip's was the place where all of the Bonneau children received their baptisms.' 6

Other members of the Negro elite also attended St. Philip's Church. On March 13, 1812, Ruth Cole sponsored the baptism of her granddaughter Ruth Raper Garden. Within the congregation of St. Philip's, the wealthiest colored persons purchased their own pews in the gallery of the church. During the early 1820s, James and Sylvia Wilson owned a pew in the south part of the gallery. Ann Mitchell inherited the pew of her husband, James Mitchell, which was situated in the north gallery. Even though Negroes were segregated in the church and confined to the galleries as well as being refused burial in the church cemetery, they flocked to St. Philip's Church. In spite of the restrictions, the church provided a setting to continue their relationships with the white aristocracy. In the congregation, many influential whites attended services. Elsewhere in Charleston, free Negroes were members of the white-dominated congregations of St. Michael's, St. Mark's, St. John's, St. Luke's, St. Paul's, St. Stephen's, and Grace Episcopal. With powerful whites in the congregations, the elite Negroes had the opportunity to ally themselves with the leading citizens of Charleston, and they petitioned the white leaders to protect their rights as free coloreds."

Free Negroes not only attended church with whites but often lived only a few doors from the gentry of Charleston City. In 1822, for example, William Brown Stevens, a free mulatto and a brick mason, was the nextdoor neighbor of Justine Angel. According to the census and the city directory, Angel lived on 126 Tradd Street and owned a plantation in St. John's Parish of Colleton District, worked by 61

slaves. On 26 George Street, Joseph Langlois, a mulatto and a shoemaker, lived on the same block with Daniel J. Waring. In 1822, Waring was an attorney of law; eight years later, he was a planter in St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish of Charleston District, and the owner of 42 slaves." In another example, Eliza Dwight, a free mulatto, resided within a few blocks from the home of George W. Cross. During the court trial of Denmark Vesey, Cross served as the black rebel's lawyer. Since several free Negroes lived in the same neighborhoods with the white gentry, it is likely that the Negro elite had dialogues with the whites, and probably expressed their disbelief at the thought of a slave rebellion.' 9

For the most part, the free Negro elite was a respected class of people. Many aristocratic whites praised this segment of the Afro-American community for being hard working and thrifty. But being praised as a respectable class meant separation from the majority of black folk. Many in the white community looked down on free Negroes who associated with slaves. These free blacks were viewed as trouble makers who stirred up discontent within the slave community. To placate the fears of white Southerners, many free Negroes shunned the slave community, creating a division between the free class and the slave class. But the main reason that the Negro elite sought to set themselves apart from slaves was one of status. The Negro elite did not want to be mistaken for slaves. They marked the distinction between themselves and slaves by using the fruit of their freedom to acquire material possessions. Many of the well-to-do free Negroes owned houses, plantations, and slaves. They made legal contracts and filed lawsuits to protect their property. Owning land and slaves, the Negro elite could not be confused with slaves, who were regarded as the lowest in the Southern social order.20

Perhaps the clearest example of the separation between the Negro elite and the slave community was the founding of the Brown Fellowship Society. In 1790, James Mitchell and four mulatto men, all members of St. Philip's Episcopal Church, organized the society. Since St. Philip's refused colored worshippers burial plots in the churchyard, they formed the fraternity to provide a cemetery for members and nonmembers. The society also assisted the widows and the orphans of its members and gave relief to free coloreds of poor status. Despite the benevolence of the Brown Fellowship Society, it excluded slaves, even nominal slaves who were awarded the rights of free blacks, from its membership. Unlike other benevolent fraternities created by free Negroes, the Brown Fellowship did not help the slave community. Other free black groups purchased slaves and manumitted them, but

the existing documents do not indicate a similar practice sponsored by the Brown Fellowship. Many of its members were commercial slaveowners and were not inclined to manumit their slaves. In 1796, for example, Samuel Holman was admitted to the colored society. Holman was a mulatto slave trader in Rio Pongo, West Africa, and a recent resident of St. James Santee, where he owned a large plantation and at least 40 slaves. In the fourth federal census of Charleston City, the following members of the Brown Fellowship were reported as slave masters: William Cooper, 4 slaves; Richard Holloway, 6 slaves; Thomas Inglis, 15 slaves; Jehu Jones, Jr., 6 slaves; John Lee, 1 slave; James Mitchell, 12 slaves; and William Penceel, 15 slaves. In 1820, William Cooper reported his female slave named Jane to the census taker; within seven years, he sold the woman for $200. Apparently he needed the cash and liquidated his human property."

While members of the society were exploiting the labor of slaves, there was probably much animosity between slaves and elite Negroes. Clearly the Brown Fellowship's members wanted to preserve the distinction between free persons of color and slaves, and so they refused membership to slaves.

The discrimination practiced by the Brown Fellowship was directed, not only against slaves, but against free persons of dark complexion. The charter of the mulatto fraternity proclaimed that membership was limited to "free brown men." Apparently the members of the Brown Fellowship viewed the dark men of Charleston City as a class somewhat above the status of slaves but beneath the status of free mulattoes. Since dark skin was associated with slavery, the elite mulattoes separated themselves from free blacks. Even though there were wealthy men of dark hue such as Samuel Creighton, whose estate was appraised at $3,540 and more valuable than that of John Weston, a mulatto member of the Brown Fellowship, the dark skin of Creighton associated him with the dreaded black majority; therefore he could not join the society. Within the mulatto community, there existed a phobia of dark-skinned people. As early as 1790, the Afro-American community was divided, not only between slave and free person, but between mulatto and black. It is somewhat difficult to determine the precise date at which the color-consciousness of mulattoes was incorporated into their society. Perhaps the color line was established during the period after the revolutionary war when the number of darkskinned people gradually began to increase. Fearing submersion by people of dark complexion, the mulattoes of Charleston sought to maintain what they perceived as a special relationship with the white aristocracy and separated

themselves from the majority of Afro-Americans, attempting to form a distinctly separate class.22

Perhaps the best example of the phobia against dark-skinned people can be seen in the marriage patterns within the mulatto elite. The vast majority of well-to-do or aspiring mulattoes married within their caste. For example, the mulatto daughters and the sons of Sally Seymour, a free black and a pastry cook, married light-skinned Negroes. By 1824, Elizabeth Seymour was married to the free mulatto tailor John Lee, and Charlotte Seymour to the free mulatto barber Edward Lee; William Weanich Seymour married the mulatto woman Mary Warren. Although Sally Seymour was of dark complexion, all of her children married mulattoes. It is difficult to determine whether the children of Sally Seymour made a conscious effort to find mulatto spouses, but the pattern of mulattoes marrying mulattoes was quite typical. In another example, Nancy Randall, the colored mistress of Thomas Hanscome (a white planter of St. James & Goose Creek Parish), witnessed the marriage of her children to free mulattoes. By 1844, Thomas Hanscome had wedded Mary Sophia Inglis, the mulatto daughter of Thomas and Martha Inglis; Elizabeth Sarah Hanscome wedded John George Garden, the mulatto son of John and Elizabeth Susan Garden; Louisa Rebecca Hanscome married the mulatto cotton gin maker William P. DaCosta; and Mary Hanscome married John Lee, the mulatto son of John and Elizabeth Lee. These examples seem to indicate a color barrier. In fact, the eighth census of 1860 provides documentation of the prevalence of mulattoes marrying mulattoes. According to the census, more than 9 out of 10 co-residing spouses of lightskinned men were mulattoes. During the early 1820s, the percentage of mulattoes married to light-skinned partners probably was equally significant."

Although Charleston City had an imbalance between females and males of free status, the shortage of free men did not deter mulatto women from searching for husbands. When free mulatto men could not be found, the women were not adverse to marrying into the slave ranks; however, their spouses were mostly mulattoes. By 1834, for example, Esther Barron, a free mulatto, had married the mulatto slave James Barron. About 12 years later, she bought her husband from William T. Rivers for $700. In another example, Georgiana Alston, a free mulatto, wedded the mulatto slave Thomas Alston and subsequently purchased his freedom for $1,000. With a significant number of male mulattoes in the slave community of Charleston District, free mulatto women were able to satisfy the desire to marry within their own color stratum, and seldom married black men. An

indication of this phenomenon can be seen in the census of 1860. In that year, only 13 percent of the mulatto women had co-residing spouses who were free black men. According to the census, there were 410 mulatto women who were heads of household and did not have co-residing spouses. Apparently, free mulatto women who were not reported with spouses chose to marry slaves, while others were concubines of white men. By and large, the existing documents suggest that light-skinned women were more inclined to wed mulatto men than to choose free Negroes of a darker hue.24

Perhaps the greatest disparity between free mulattoes and free blacks was the distribution of wealth. Few Afro-Americans of dark complexion were as rich as the wealthy mulattoes. Between 1800 and 1840, members of the mulatto elite amassed property of substantial value. In 1825, William Penceel, a mulatto tin plate maker, owned property valued at $3,234. In 1833, Jehu Jones, Sr., a member of the Brown Fellowship Society and a tailor, amassed property appraised at $1,250.25 The wealthiest mulatto was Thomas Inglis, a barber, who accumulated property valued at $36,662 in 1835. Between 1800 and 1840, the mean wealth of the dark-skinned elite was $1,805. But the mean wealth of the mulatto elite was $4,642. The average wealth of the mulatto elite was more than twice that of their dark-skinned counterparts. In Charleston City, between 1800 and 1840, the wealthiest Afro-American of dark complexion was Samuel Creighton, a barber, who owned property valued at $3,540. Yet his wealth could not compare with that amassed by Thomas Inglis. Indeed, the mulatto barber's estate had more than ten times the value of the darkskinned barber's. Even the richest dark man of South Carolina could not surpass the wealth of the mulatto elite in Charleston City. In 1850, Lamb Stevens owned a 500-acre plantation called Cherry Hill in St. James & Goose Creek Parish, and 30 slaves to till the soil. The wealth of the 80-year-old planter was estimated at $12,118. Yet the black rice planter acquired about one-third of the wealth accumulated by Thomas Inglis. Apparently color not only separated mulattoes from blacks but created a disparity between wealthy members of the two castes. Although the figures demonstrate a gulf between elite mulattoes and elite blacks, they do not show what caused the difference. Did the mulattoes of Charleston City work harder than their darker counterparts, or were mulattoes the receivers of special patronage which dark-skinned persons were denied?26

What caused the economic disparity in the Afro-American community was a combination of hard work and, most importantly, special patronage by white Charlestonians. For the dark-skinned

artisans, clients were difficult to acquire. Apparently whites preferred to deal with lightskinned Negroes, and such color-consciousness did not permit darkskinned Afro-Americans to achieve the degree of economic security obtained by the mulatto elite.27

Along with white patronage, some mulattoes were given a head start. Favors by white benefactors and parents as well as mulatto parents and relatives helped the mulatto elite to establish themselves. Sometimes the favors were cash, real estate, credit, and even slaves. White men often gave property to their Afro-American mistresses. In the will of Thomas Hanscome, a white planter, Hanscome gave the sum of $15,000 to his colored mistress. In another example, James Holton, a white Charlestonian, bequeathed all of his personal estate and the house on Cumberland Street to the mulatto woman Lattice and their seven children. White Charlestonians provided not only for their concubines but also for the children of miscegenation. Francis Carmand, a white tailor, gave his mulatto son the sum of $500 and two slaves. William Wightman provided his mulatto daughter by the colored woman Jane Wightman with $20,000. The majority of well-to-do mulatto parents could not match the gifts given by whites, but they provided their children with a firm economic foundation. Barbara Barquet, the wife of John P. Barquet, provided her daughter Caroline Plumeau with five slaves, then gave her grandchildren the sum of $1,000. Although few mulatto parents provided their children with the amount of property given by Mrs. Barquet, they gave their offspring what small possessions they could. In 1826, for example, Ann Brown, the wife of Moses Brown, requested that her small house on Price Alley should be given to her five children. If mulatto parents could not afford to give their offspring cash, they trained them to work in trades. 28 During the 1820s and the 1830s, two of the sons of Ann and Moses Brown worked in the barber shop owned by their father. After the death of the elder Brown, his sons continued to work as barbers and probably catered to the white clients who patronized the shop of Moses Brown. Other relatives also assisted the younger family members on occasion. Hannah McKenzie, for example, transferred the legal title to the 25-year-old slave Joe to her grandson Robert Mishaw. According to the deed, "the income ensuing from the wages of the said boy" would be applied by her grandson toward supporting her great-grandchildren "until they shall attain the age of 21 years." Even the babies of the mulatto elite were provided for by well-to-do relatives. Few of the black elite provided their children with the amount of property given by the mulatto elite.29

The color prejudice directed against the black elite did not cause

the small number of well-to-do blacks to join the ranks of slaves. Like the elite mulattoes who separated themselves from blacks, the elite blacks distinguished themselves from their countless dark-skinned counterparts held in bondage. While Denmark Vesey was raising the consciousness of the black masses and telling them to throw off the chains of slavery, free persons of dark hue were buying and selling slaves for profit. During that period, Rebecca Jackson, a stoutly built black woman, worked in the city as a washerwoman. After years of saving, she bought a woman to help in the washing of her clients' clothes. But finding the slave difficult to manage, she sold her. For nearly 35 years, Rebecca Jackson continued to purchase and sell human chattel. In 1830, she sold Charity for $180.70 Before Mrs. Jackson died, she owned five slaves and requested her son Henry Jackson to sell her human property. On March 3, 1841, Martha, the daughter of Rose, was sold for $505. The mother and the sisters of the slave girl were auctioned on April 27, 31, and May 1. In another example, Sylvia Mannell, a free woman of dark complexion, liquidated her human chattel for $225 in 1817. And Moses Well, a dark-skinned shoemaker, sold his 17-year-old servant for $400. Although Rebecca Jackson, Sylvia Mannell, and Moses Wells were the same color as the majority of the slaves living in Charleston City, the common bond of complexion did not deter them from exploiting their own race for profit. Slavery was an oppressive institution when it personally touched the lives of the black elite -when loved ones were held in bondage-but in other cases it was a legal and a viable investment. Money was the major reason for blacks exploiting other blacks."

Whether the majority of the black elite sympathized with white slavers cannot be answered conclusively. Yet, without doubt, there was support for institutionalized slavery. For every free black who may have sympathized with Denmark Vesey, there were blacks who helped preserve the peculiar institution. They not only bought and sold slaves but returned runaway slaves. In 1793, Robert Baldwin, a free Negro of dark complexion, was employed by James Clitherall to search for the slave Joe, who had escaped from bondage and headed towards Georgia.32

With little solidarity between the elite blacks and the dark-skinned slaves of Charleston City, there quite naturally was division within the black community. Yet the gulf was small when compared to the division between the mulatto elite and the slaves. The number of elite blacks was quite small, and an even smaller number owned slaves for profit. Of the 184 Negro slaveowners of Charleston City who were reported to be mulatto or black, there were only 27 masters with dark complexion, according to the federal census of 1850. Dark-

skinned masters comprised 14.6 percent of the Afro-American slaveowners, while the mulattoes represented 85.4 percent. A similar figure can likely be attributed to the households headed by free Negro masters on the federal census of 1820.

Even as the members of both elite groups attempted to distance themselves from the slave ranks, they were drawn into the slave community. During the early 1800s, it was not unusual for well-to-do free Negroes to marry slaves. Thomas S. Bonneau, a mulatto schoolteacher and a member of the Brown Fellowship Society, married the mulatto slave owned by Sarah M. Summers. In another example, Mose Irvine wedded the slave Harriett, who was the property of Mary Russell. Often the elite Negroes bought the freedom of their spouses. In 1810 Sarah Edwards, a free black woman, married the slave of Isaac Edwards. Upon the death of her husband's master, she accumulated enough money to buy the freedom of her spouse in 1818. While the majority of free Negroes who purchased the freedom of spouses were married to their loved ones before the transaction, others bought slaves and subsequently married their bondsmen. In 1828, for example, Hannah Morrison, a free black woman, bought the slave Martin from Margaret Stock. After nearly eight years of holding Martin Nelson as her property, she apparently became infatuated with the slave and subsequently married him. When the males of the Negro elite married slave women, they often confronted the dilemma of producing offspring who were owned by white masters. Few of the wealthy AfroAmericans accumulated the capital to buy the freedom of all their children. Even when the money was raised, there was no guarantee the owners of their offspring would not depart with the young slaves. By 1820 many of the Negro elite had offspring or other close relatives who were slaves to white masters. Even though they wanted to separate from the slave community, their loved ones were part of the masses of slaves. If the separation was not physically possible, they made a mental separation; they did not think of their loved ones as slaves or view their destiny as similar to that of the slaves. But there could not be a complete separation from the slave community until the liberty of loved ones was obtained."

Between 1820 and 1822, the Charleston of Denmark Vesey was a divided city, where free Negro snobbery created a barrier which separated free Afro-Americans and slaves. Being an astute man, Vesey knew that the free Negro community could not be counted on as supporters of the revolution. He was aware of the threat imposed by the Negro elite because of their personal relationships with whites. He cautioned his followers to avoid the elite and tried to keep the plans of

the insurrection from them. So secret was the planned revolution that even free Negroes who helped the slave community and earned the respect of many bondsmen were excluded from the insurrection. Even Bishop Maurice Brown, who purchased slaves for the sole reason of manumitting them, was kept in the dark about the slave insurrection. Indeed, none of the influential members of the African Methodist Church, such as Charles Corr and Henry Drayton, were aware of the planned uprising." Even though these free Afro-Americans were members of the African Church and aided the slave community as well as trying to bridge the gap between free Negroes and slaves, they were perceived as threats. Men like Bishop Brown, Charles Corr, and Henry Drayton were committed to peaceful change. Their religious convictions led them to believe that if freedom could not be achieved while living, it would be given to the righteous at death. But Denmark Vesey was not concerned about the hereafter. What mattered was the present. Freedom was not the reward of the righteous slave at death, but the divine right of all men and women regardless of race. Vesey was determined to take the nectar of sweetness called freedom for all of his people by any means necessary. Vesey saw the weakness of the theology taught by fellow members of the African Church and preached a revolutionary doctrine. He knew that his radicalism was too much for his free Negro associates to withstand, and he feared that if they became aware of the plot, betrayal was certain.

Yet the betrayal actually came from numerous sectors of the free Negro community. As Vesey made plans for the revolution, there were many slaveowners within the free Afro-American population. In 1820, for example, Negro heads of household who owned slaves were reported at 72.1 percent of Afro-American dwellings in Charleston City. In the neighboring suburb of Charleston Neck, slightly more than half of the Negro households were listed with slave property. Almost everywhere Denmark Vesey traveled within the city, he encountered free Negro slaveowners. When he went to the African Methodist Church, located on Anson Street, to attend services, he walked past the houses of Negro masters. Within walking distance from the church lived George Charnock, a mulatto tinner, who owned two slaves. A short distance up Anson Street lived two mulatto masters: Benjamin Lincoln, the owner of five slaves, and Charles Henry, who owned a slave carpenter. (Both Lincoln and Henry eventually liquidated their slave property.) Even when Denmark Vesey was recruiting the slave Jesse and walked up St. Philips Street towards Liberty Street, he was about two blocks from the house of Julia Eggart. In March 1821, Eggart, a mulatto, purchased Grace, a 17-year-old black woman, for $400. Within six blocks from Vesey's home on Bull Street, there were

four Afro-Americans on Beaufain Street who owned slave property. For example, Richard Holloway, a carpenter, owned six slaves. The other masters were Fanny Graham, one slave; Tissey Remoussin, one slave; and Rachel Wells, five slaves. Even the next-door neighbors of Denmark Vesey eventually purchased slaves. At 6 Bull Street, Sophia Kinlock, the mulatto wife of Richmond Kinlock, bought Peggy, a 12-year-old black girl, for $300 in 1822. And Robert Smyth, a mulatto carpenter, who lived about two or four houses from Denmark Vesey at 15 Bull Street, owned six slaves in 1820."

Although a few of the Negro masters who lived in the immediate vicinity of Denmark Vesey may have owned relatives, they still were a threat to the slave insurrection. Indeed, benevolent masters were committed to preserving the nominal freedom they granted their slave relatives and would not chance such an extreme action. If the revolution failed, their loved ones, who were legally defined as slaves, could be confiscated and sold by creditors or seized as vacant property when there were no legal heirs. There was also the threat of execution for the free black rebels. Whether benevolent or commercial, the Negro masters of Charleston would not support a slave rebellion. And Denmark Vesey knew it and tried to avoid them. The success of the revolution demanded absolute loyalty, warranting the exclusion of the Negro elite and most of the free black community.

In fact, none of the lieutenants of Denmark Vesey were free persons of color. His closest confidants were Gullah Jack, Monday Gell, Peter Poyas, Rolla Bennett, Mingo Harth, and Mingo's son, all of whom were slaves. Few free Negroes were willing to risk their own freedom and kill hundreds of whites to secure liberty for the masses of black folk. Many in the free black community could not fathom such a radical reaction. Others doubted that Vesey could garner the support necessary from the slave community to accomplish a successful revolution. When Adam, a free person of color, was approached and told about the insurrection, he did not believe Vesey could muster the bodies needed to take Charleston. And Edward Johnson, a free Negro, would not join the revolution until it had started. Indeed, Johnson was a rarity. Most free Negroes were concerned about their own daily lives and did not conspire with slaves. 16

Even within the slave community, there was much reluctance about the insurrection. Several slaves told Vesey or his lieutenants that they would have nothing to do with the plot. Some were concerned about killing their masters and chose not to join the slave rebels. Others were concerned about the indiscriminate killing of women and children. Still others were convinced the rebels would be

suppressed by whites and executed. Despite the reluctance of many slaves, the insurrection was kept from the knowledge of white Charlestonians for nearly four years.

Eventually the reluctance of one slave led to betrayal. On Saturday, May 25, 1822, William Paul, a cohort of Denmark Vesey, had a chance encounter with Peter Desverneys, the mulatto slave of Colonel J.C. Prioleau. Paul attempted to convince the slave to join the ranks of the rebels. Desverneys, a contented slave, rebuked the rebel. Yet the encounter with William Paul worried the loyal servant of Colonel Prioleau. Burdened by the information Paul had given him, he finally sought the counsel of a free mulatto named William Penceel. Penceel urged the slave to inform his master about the insurrection. Desverneys rushed home to do so. Finding that his master was out of town, he informed Prioleau's wife and son. When Colonel Prioleau returned from his trip, Desverneys once again told his horrendous story and shocked his master into immediate action. With deliberate haste, Colonel Prioleau contacted the authorities. Peter Desverneys was brought in to be questioned. After he told his story and alerted the local officials, the first arrest was made. On May 30, William Paul was arraigned. Paul confessed and implicated two of Vesey's lieutenants. On May 31, Mingo Harth and Peter Poyas were arrested and subsequently questioned. Under the close interrogation of the warden, both men calmly denied the accusations made by William Paul and were released.

Alarmed by the disclosures and the possibility of further linkage, Vesey moved the date of the insurrection from July 14 to June 16. By the second week of June 1822, the final preparations had been made to capture the city of Charleston. Vesey and his cohorts gathered pikes, bayonets, and daggers to be used as weapons when the assault took place. They also planned to procure firearms from the local merchants. The slave Bacchus Hammett boasted that he could acquire "a keg of Powder ... and five hundred (500) muskets from his master's store on the night of the 16th." Since the revolution was scheduled for Sunday night, Denmark Vesey and his lieutenants intended to use the day of worship as a cover to spread the message of the insurrection to the plantation slaves. On Saturday, June 15, Vesey provided the slave Jesse with two dollars so that the slave could hire a horse and go to Johns Island, where he would inform "the people to be down on the night of the 16th." Also, Frank, another slave rebel, had recruited slaves from four plantations and hoped to lead them into the city. With the assistance of the slave barbers of Charleston City, the rebels were provided with wigs and whiskers to conceal their identities when the arsenal would be seized. A few days before the planned

revolution, Vesey even wrote a letter to the leaders of Santo Domingo and requested the aid of the black Jacobins. With weapons, manpower, and perhaps the moral support of the slaves of Charleston, the revolution was scheduled to start. At the stroke of midnight, Vesey and the slave rebels proposed to descend on the city while Charlestonians were sound asleep. In the stillness of night, havoc would be wreaked. Freedom would be bestowed on the black masses - freedom obtained by the blood of divine vengeance."

But even as Vesey gathered his followers for an imminent strike, the conspiracy was unraveling. When the Charleston authorities could not get William Paul to deny his story, they decided to continue their investigation and employed the slave George Wilson as a spy. While attending the conference of the slave rebels, he confirmed the gravest horrors of white Charlestonians. A slave insurrection really was planned and was scheduled for June 16. With the information provided by George Wilson, the city of Charleston was under siege. Governor Bennett communicated with John C. Calhoun, the Secretary of War, and requested federal troops. By June 16, five military companies, commanded by Robert Hayne, patrolled the streets of Charleston."

The evidence gathered by George Wilson permitted the local authorities to locate and arrest the rebel leaders. Within two days, ten slaves were arrested, including Peter Poyas, Batteau Bennett, Ned Bennett, and Rolla Bennett. Between June 19 and June 27, there were fifteen arrests made by the authorities. Indeed, Denmark Vesey was one of the fifteen rebels arrested. He had evaded the patrols for six days before he was captured at the house of his wife. While he was at large, white Charlestonians were almost in a state of panic. Doors were locked. Slave masters questioned their loyal servants and wondered if they were black Jacobins. By July 2, all of the rebel leaders were captured and held in jail.39

While in jail, the rebels were placed in chains and kept isolated from their cohorts. Long into the night, they were interrogated or tortured in an attempt to force them to implicate others. But Denmark Vesey and his lieutenants took an oath of silence. When Peter Poyas was interrogated, he responded with only a "cryptic smile." With the exception of Rolla Bennett and Monday Gell, all of the leaders remained silent. For the most part, they maintained their composure and prepared for death.40

Once the trials had started, it was only a matter of time before Vesey and his followers would be executed. Yet they faced the gallows

with courage. While a crowd of white Charlestonians waited for the executions to commence, Peter Poyas challenged the other blacks: "Do not open your lips; die silent, as you shall see me do!"•' Denmark Vesey showed his followers in life how to be a proud black man, urging the slaves to be men and to take their freedom; he also showed them how to die with conviction. When his last breath was taken, he had not uttered a word against his companions.

As Charleston purged itself of the black rebels, there were 35 slaves executed. By the end of July, more than 30 blacks were deported from the state. The local authorities prohibited the black sympathizers from dressing in black or wearing black crape to mourn the dead. The bodies of the rebels were given to the city surgeons for dissection. Although the rebels suffered death without accomplishing their objective, they died knowing that a major effort had been made to seize their freedom. But fate had crushed their hopes of liberty, and death was the only reward for them. While death claimed their bodies, their images were implanted in the psyche of Charlestonians for decades after the planned revolution.42

The white authorities praised the loyalty of the three AfroAmericans who had betrayed the revolution and saved Charleston from a bloody uprising. Had not Peter Desverneys mentioned the plot to William Penceel, and had Penceel not urged the slave to expose the conspiracy, all of Charleston would have felt the wrath of the black masses. For the information he provided, Peter Desverneys was manumitted by the state assembly and awarded the annual sum of $50. William Penceel was exempted from the free Negro capitation tax and received a reward of $1,000. And George Wilson was given his freedom and a yearly pension of $50.03

Little is known about the mulatto informers beyond the fact that they betrayed their own race. Why did they expose Denmark Vesey? Did they sympathize with the white slavers? When the two slaves were freed, how did the free Negro community treat them? Were they ostracized for their treachery? These are just a few of the questions which have remained unanswered. But by profiling the lives of Peter Desverneys, George Wilson, and William Penceel, some answers might be found.

As the slave of Colonel J.C. Prioleau, Peter Desverneys was a trusted house servant. Apparently the 32-year-old mulatto was contented with his status as property. When recruited to join the uprising of Denmark Vesey, the slave replied that he was "satisfied with my condition, that I was grateful to my master for his kindness

and wished no change." Yet, when freedom was offered to the so-called satisfied slave, he took his liberty with little hesitation. Perhaps Desverneys betrayed Denmark Vesey because he wanted his freedom and perceived the slave revolt as an impossible method of obtaining liberty. Rather than being the loyal slave portrayed in the court testimony, he was a pragmatic man who saw the opportunity of achieving freedom by performing a heroic deed; therefore he betrayed Denmark Vesey. If Desverneys had been a dedicated slave, he would not have taken his freedom but would have remained the loyal servant of his master. Undoubtedly, he wanted his freedom just as much as any slave and betrayed the black masses to obtain his own liberty. Regardless of his motives, he was freed from slavery on December 25, 1822, and joined the community of free Afro-Americans."

As a free man, he was not ostracized by the Negro elite. In fact, Peter Desverneys married Sarah A. Cole, the widowed wife of the deceased John Cole and the daughter of Sally Seymour, the renowned pastry cook of Charleston City. His marriage made him the brother-in-law of William W. Seymour, a member of the Brown Fellowship Society and a tavern keeper, who owned eight slaves in 1842. His sister-in-law was Eliza Lee, the proprietor of the Mansion House and later of the Jones Inn. Eliza Lee also was the owner of a slave named Summer in 1825. The marriage of Peter Desverneys established influential connections with the elite members of the free Negro society. Furthermore, the marriage indicates that he was not shunned by the elite Negroes. After all, many of the mulatto elite were commercial slaveowners. Men like James Brown, George Charnock, William Cooper, John L. Francis, Richard Holloway, Thomas Inglis, Jehu Jones, John Lee, Richard Moore, and William Penceel probably praised the former slave because he protected their slave property and perhaps their lives. He also uplifted the position of the free mulattoes in the eyes of white aristocrats. By and large, the Negro elite viewed Peter Desverneys as a hero."

By 1840, Peter Desverneys had strengthened his ties to the white power structure. In that year, he was reported as the head of a household which contained six slaves. Out of the six slaves that he owned, two were the servants Alfred Sanders and Lavinia Cole, who were married on December 21, 1837. In the latter part of 1838, his slaveholding increased when Lavinia Cole Sanders gave birth to a healthy little boy named George. Apparently Peter Desverneys used the adult slaves as laborers. It is likely that Alfred Sanders worked as a dray driver while Lavinia Cole Sanders was hired out. Whatever the labor of the slaves may have been, they were property. And Peter

Desverneys did not let his slaves forget that fact. Indeed, the cold reality of ownership became quite clear to Alfred and Lavinia Sanders when, in 1849, Peter Desverneys sold the 9-year-old son of the slave couple for $325. The sale must have devastated the couple. But Peter Desverneys either needed the cash or wanted to assert his power over the slave parents. Without question, Desverneys was a commercial slave master. In his will, he ordered his executors to "sell the said Slave [Lavinia Cole Sanders] with the issue and increase at public auction and execute [a] good and sufficient Bill of sale." However, the sale was conditioned to take place after the death of his wife. When the 72-year-old mulatto died, his wife collected the wages of Lavinia Cole Sanders and appropriated the money for her own benefit. As late as July 1863, she received the wages of her slave, which amounted to $21. With the ownership of slave property, Peter Desverneys had a direct interest in preserving the peculiar institution. Despite being a former slave, he still acquired human chattel and treated them no better or worse than the typical white master. Perhaps the fact that he was a mulatto shielded him from the reality of his actions. After all, he was not exploiting a fellow mulatto. Maybe slavery was only a business and a means of earning a livelihood. Whatever reasons may have prompted him to acquire slaves, he was a brown master with the soul of a white slaver.46

Undoubtedly Peter Desverneys was proud of his life. Indeed, he thought so highly of his betrayal of Denmark Vesey that it was mentioned in his will. A few years before his death, he even petitioned the state assembly to increase the annual pension given to him. In the petition, he flaunted the virtue of his action and reminded the legislators what could have happened if he had kept silent. For the most part, Peter Desverneys typified the mulatto elite of Charleston City. Totally removed from the masses of black folk, he only wanted to deal with dark-skinned people in a master-slave relationship.07

The case of George Wilson was quite a different story. According to the death records of Charleston City, he was a dark-skinned man and may have sympathized with the black masses. But he was 46 years old when Denmark Vesey made the leap of faith towards freedom. Fearing liberty would never be obtained for himself or his family, he saw an opportunity to gain freedom. It is not known whether he was the only slave approached with the prospect of spying on Denmark Vesey or why he was chosen, but his act of betrayal was rewarded with emancipation. On Christmas Day of 1825, he referred to himself as George Watkins. Yet his freedom could not George Wilson brought him, not only the security of knowing he never would

be sold, but the responsibility of a free man and a new name. In 1825, he referred to himself as George Watkin. Yet his freedom could not be totally enjoyed because his family was owned by L.S. Campbell. Unlike Peter Desverneys, he had a wife and a son who were slaves. Working as a skilled artisan, he saved enough money to buy his loved ones for $100 in 1825. In 1830, his wife, Jenny, and their son, Sampson, were reported on the census as his slaves.08 Holding the legal title to his loved ones troubled him. Knowing their nominal freedom could be protected only while he himself was living, he was faced with a major dilemma. The only way he could free his family was to petition the state assembly and ask for a deed of manumission. In 1835, he made the formal request, but it was turned down by the special committee of the judiciary. By 1840 he continued to own his wife and children as well as five grandchildren. Perhaps the stress and worry of owning loved ones caused him to lose his sanity. In March 1848, he went insane and died. The records suggest that George Wilson, unlike Peter Desverneys, was a benevolent master who held only family members and did not buy slaves for profit. Apparently, he only wanted freedom and viewed his part in the thwarted insurrection as a means of obtaining liberty for himself and family.49

But the reason William Penceel thwarted the slave uprising centered on the simple fact that he was a slaveowner for profit. As early as 1808, he was the owner of the slave woman Bella. In 1814, he purchased Stephen, an 8-year-old black boy, for $180. According to the census of 1820, he was the owner of two slaves, probably Bella and Stephen. Apparently William Penceel used the slave boy, who was 14 years old in 1820, as an apprentice in his tin plate business. Later, the mulatto tin maker purchased a 20-yearold black woman named Nancy. For William Penceel, the slave rebellion represented a threat to his property. As the editor of the Charleston Courier observed, the right of slaveownership by free Negroes gave them "a stake in the institution of slavery" and made it "[their] interest as well as [their] duty to uphold it." Perhaps the editor of the Courier was referring to William Penceel. Without question, William Penceel feared the slave insurrection headed by Denmark Vesey, and he persuaded Peter Desverneys to disclose the conspiracy so that his slave property would be protected.so

Perhaps William Penceel was also plagued by a more subliminal fear of being submerged into a sea of blackness. Penceel was a mulatto and a member of the exclusive Brown Fellowship Society, and he probably adhered to the mulatto doctrine of separation from the black masses. If Charleston had become a Santo Domingo, what would have

happened to the mulattoes of wealth? He probably weighed that question throughout the discovery of the conspiracy. He knew the destiny of the elite mulattoes of free status if the revolution of Denmark Vesey succeeded. Throughout the city of Charleston, there were free mulattoes who sought refuge from the revolution in Santo Domingo. They served as a symbol of the dangers of servile insurrection. Many of the mulatto emigrants from Santo Domingo lost property which consisted of land and slaves. Consequently, they viewed the black revolution of Toussaint L'Ouverture as their ruin. Although William Penceel was not born in Santo Domingo, his neighbors once lived in the former French colony. Within a few blocks from the home of William Penceel, which was located on Logan Street, lived two mulatto women who had once lived in Santo Domingo. At 11 LegareStreet, Maria Rose Derac resided with her stepdaughter, along with four black females of slave status who were owned by the mulatto woman. And on 48 Tradd Street, which was within walking distance of Penceel's home, lived Francoise Perrier. Since the free mulatto community was quite small and close-knit, it is likely that William Penceel not only knew Maria Rose Derac and Francoise Perrier but was close friends with the two colored women. The women probably informed him of the conditions in Santo Domingo and told him the reasons for their flight from the island. Santo Domingo was not amicable to white or brown masters. But more importantly, the status of free mulattoes was threatened by the masses of black people, whose interests were not always similar to those of the mulatto elite of Santo Domingo. The prospect of black revolution in Charleston was seen by William Penceel as the second coming of Toussaint L'Ouverture. He perceived the Denmark Vesey conspiracy as a threat to his position within the Southern hierarchy. Although the mulatto elite was below the status of white persons, they had the right to own property and to file suit in court. The prospect of rule by the slaves who were owned by the mulatto elite meant submersion within the black masses and perhaps a lower status in the new social order. The fear of such submersion may have haunted William Penceel and caused him to side with the white slaveowners."

Regardless of his motives, William Penceel benefitted from his role in the dismal defeat of Denmark Vesey and the slaves of Charleston. By proclamation of the state assembly, he was awarded $1,000 and exempted from the capitation tax which was imposed on adult free Negroes. Demonstrating his commitment to the peculiar institution, he used part of his bounty to purchase slaves. On January 16, 1823, he bought Sukey and her two children, Thorn and Harriet, for $700. The purchase occurred within one month after the reward

was provided by the state legislature. By April 1825, Penceel owned an estate valued at $3,234. The estate consisted of five slaves and a house on Logan Street. Nearly one-third of his wealth was attributed to the bounty for betraying Denmark Vesey.12

While many within the slave community viewed William Penceel as an enemy and a traitor, he remained a respected and honorable man to the mulatto elite and the white citizens of Charleston City. A member of the Brown Fellowship Society, he faced no movement to expel him from the elite fraternity of free mulattoes. On the contrary, he was part of a colored society dominated by slave masters, who viewed his role in exposing the slave rebellion as a responsible reaction. Needless to say, white Charlestonians praised him. They perceived him as a safe Negro. He was a respectable mulatto who served as a buffer between the white masters and the black majority of Charleston City. To demonstrate their gratitude, white Charlestonians signed a petition to allow the brother of William Penceel to enter the state as a free man of color. Sometime after the slave conspiracy, Charles Penceel had left the state and traveled to the North, where he visited friends. But the Act of 1822, which was passed before his visit, denied him the privilege of returning to South Carolina. Fearing he would be exiled for life, he sought the aid of his brother. William Penceel then used his influence to garner the support of the white aristocrats of Charleston City. With pressure from an array of influential citizens, the state assembly passed the statute which permitted Charles Penceel to reenter the state. S' On December 17, 1824, the bill numbered 2351 declared:

> whereas it appears by the testimonials of many of the good citizens of ... Charleston, that the said Charles Pencil is a person of good character and belongs to a family who have done much public service in the deletion of the late servile rebellion of Charleston ... the said Charles Pencil [shall] be ... permitted to return to ... this State."

Although William Penceel received the support of influential white friends, if he had not exposed the Denmark Vesey conspiracy, he would not have acquired the special bill. The state assembly did not reverse the statute which prohibited free blacks from entering or reentering the state after the passage of the bill for Charles Penceel. For example, Jehu Jones, Sr., the respected owner of the Jones' Inn, was denied the right to return to the state despite the aid of prominent whites of Charleston City. In many cases, the respect that William Penceel had among the white aristocracy could not be matched by the wealthiest free mulattoes of South Carolina."

The advantages William Penceel enjoyed did not filter down to the free Negro community in general. Despite the fact that a free Negro helped to dispel the slave plot, the state assembly moved to restrict the free AfroAmerican community. On December 1, 1822, the state legislators passed a statute which forced free Negro males above the age of 15 to take a white guardian or be sold into slavery. Although the law was not enacted until June of 1823, free Negroes wasted little time in finding guardians. On March 8, 1823, Thomas Siah Bonneau elicited the aid of William Dewees, Jr., to serve as his guardian. On that same date, Edward Carews agreed to serve as the guardian of James Brown. About four weeks later, Malcolm Brown, the son of Bishop Brown, was able to secure H.H. Bacot as his guardian. At first the role of the white guardian was to attest to the character of the free Negro. Eventually, it developed into a protective role where the guardians defended the liberty of free Negroes from swindlers who sought to enslave them. However, the state viewed the guardian system as a means of controlling the free Negro community. First of all, the local authorities had a record of free Negro males and where they resided. Also, if the free Afro-American did not behave himself or lost his guardian, the colored person could be forced into slavery if another white guardian was not found. The Act of 1822 also called for the enslavement of free Negroes who left the state and tried to return. Finally, those free Afro-Americans born outside of the state who were not residents in 1817 had to pay an annual tax of $50 or face enslavement. 16

By late 1822 and early 1823, repression against free Negroes came not only from the state assembly but from the local authorities of Charleston City. Once the slave conspiracy was discovered, a mob of white Charlestonians burned the African Methodist Church to the ground. The local authorities also forced Bishop Maurice Brown to flee the state or face enslavement, even though it was proven he had nothing to do with the slave conspiracy. As the panic swelled, vigilante associations patrolled the streets of Charleston and strongly enforced the laws which controlled free Negroes."

For the most part, white Charlestonians spoke loudly but enacted nothing extreme. A petition presented by the working class declared that free Negroes and slaves shared a common bond. The petition stated that the two groups were "associated by color, connected by marriages and friend ships." It went on to say that "free Negroes have parents, brothers, sisters and children, who are slaves; should an insurrection occur, they would have every inducement to join it." After condemning the free Negro community, the petition asked that

Afro-Americans be denied the right to own property. Other citizens demanded the complete banishment of the free Negro caste. Many of the strongest critics of free Negroes came from the working class of Charleston, which competed with free AfroAmericans. They would have been the benefactors of any extreme measures against free Negroes. But calmer heads prevailed."

Astute Charlestonians were aware that free Negroes served as a buffer zone between white masters and slaves. Contrary to the opinion of the working class of Charleston, which viewed free Negroes as a threat, the aristocrats saw the division within the Afro-American community and sought to exploit the schism. As Edwin C. Holland observed, "Most [free mulattoes] are industrious, sober, hard-working mechanics, who have large families and considerable property: and ... abhor the idea of an association with the blacks in any enterprise that may have for its object revolution." He went on to say, "The greater part of them own slaves themselves, and are, therefore, so far interested in this species of property, as to keep them in the watch, and induce them to disclose any plans that may be injurious to our peace." Like Holland, white aristocrats of Charleston maintained that free Negroes supported the Southern system and were a safe class of loyal residents. Many of the aristocracy viewed the free Negro community as a useful entity which protected the interest of white slaveowners. Well-to-do Charlestonians therefore supported the existence of free Afro-Americans. After the slave plot was uncovered, Governor Thomas Bennett refused to implicate the free Negro community. He suggested that the threat to the security of the citizens of Charleston came from outside agitators. 19

Nevertheless, one member of the "safe" free black community broke with his class and fought against the Southern system of slavery. What caused Denmark Vesey to rebel when so many in the free AfroAmerican community chose a safer course? Being a free black and a man of wealth, Denmark Vesey had much to lose; yet he instigated the slave conspiracy. Many within the power structure of Charleston could not understand why he had organized the rebellion. Judge Lionel H. Kennedy commented, "It is difficult to imagine what infatuation could have prompted you to attempt an enterprise so wild and visionary." Although the danger of discovery was quite high, Denmark Vesey felt the urgent need to free all of his people. Other free blacks wanted to achieve the goal of freedom, but they did not attempt such a radical plan. Determining what separated Denmark Vesey from the rank and file of free blacks may answer the question posed by Judge Kennedy.60

Although Denmark Vesey shared a common heritage with the free blacks of Charleston, he was not born within the Southern society but nurtured in the bosom of Africa. Perhaps his African experience made a difference. Memories of Africa were fresh in Vesey's mind. He recalled his capture and forced exile from the continent. In the year of 1781, he was one of 390 blacks who saw freedom slowly slip away. On a slave ship bound for Santo Domingo, he appeared to be destined for oblivion. But fate delivered him from the realm of obscurity. There was something special about the 14-year-old slave boy. Perhaps a certain sparkle in the slave boy's eyes caught the fancy of Captain Vesey, who kept him as a cabin boy. Even though he was sold to a Santo Domingo planter, he was later reunited with Captain Vesey and became the property of the old man. For 20 years, he was the slave of Captain Vesey. During his servitude, he traveled to Africa, Santo Domingo, and the state of South Carolina. Denmark Vesey was a privileged slave whose master treated him with compassion. He was even taught to read and write. But he was still property, and he wanted to be free. In 1800, fortune smiled on Denmark Vesey when he won the (East Bay Street) lottery and purchased his freedom."

Yet the experiences of Denmark Vesey were not so very different from those of his free black counterparts who chose not to join him and fight for freedom. Within the free population of black Charleston, there were other Africans who were stolen from the land of their parents, yet they were not compelled to challenge the system of slavery. For example, Aberdeen Forrest was born in West Africa, but his life was similar to that of most free Negroes. Although he was opposed to slavery, he chose a peaceful course which centered around the acquisition of family members who remained in bondage. Working as a cooper, he saved enough money to buy the freedom of his wife Bess in 1809. By 1820 he owned four slaves who probably were related to him. Other Africans joined the ranks of the free black community and became what the aristocracy of Charleston called the "safe" class. In February 1801, Zamie, a woman of African birth, bought the 14-year-old girl Angelique. About ten months later, she purchased Victor for $700.62 As an owner of slave property, Zamie was not a threat to the institution of slavery.

Actually, domestic slavery was quite common in West Africa. Although the system of African slavery was not as exploitative as the institution established by Europeans, it was still forced servitude. In fact, in the parish of St. Thomas & St. Dennis, there lived a family of African-born slavers who owned more than 100 slaves in 1800. Two members of the African family were active in the slave trade when the

state assembly reopened the commerce in human chattel. Apparently, the common bond of African birth did not unite the small number of free blacks who were born on the continent. Furthermore, the African birth of Denmark Vesey did not cause him to despise slavery. His hatred of slavery was a product of 20 years of bondage."

However, even having known the chains of slavery did not prompt other black Charlestonians of free status to join the ranks of the rebels. Many of the former slaves had had kind masters who had permitted them to purchase their freedom. Others were related to their owners by ties of kinship. Within that segment of the former slave population, there was little of the bitterness that characterized Denmark Vesey. Others remembered the humiliation of slavery but did not care to jeopardize their freedom, which was too sweet to risk.

Once freed, the former slaves were concerned about earning a livelihood rather than instigating a slave uprising. For 18 years, Denmark Vesey was preoccupied with his trade. Vesey was a skilled carpenter. Catering to the whites of Charleston, he accumulated a modest estate. By 1819 he was the owner of a house on Bull Street. His wealth was estimated at $3,000.64 Vesey typified the free black artisans in that he was hardworking and thrifty. From sunup until sundown, artisans like Vesey worked and maintained their freedom, and a few accumulated wealth which surpassed that of many white Charlestonians. Even the estate amassed by Denmark Vesey was more valuable than most of the working men of Charleston, white or black.

Yet Denmark Vesey's wealth did not draw him towards the slave masters of Charleston. Vesey saw slavery as an oppressive institution and abstained from the purchasing of slaves for profit when so many of his race were acquiring slave laborers. With his wealth, he could easily have purchased slaves, but racial pride ran through his veins.

From 1800 to 1822, Denmark Vesey witnessed the abuses of slavery. He saw the separation of husbands from wives and parents from children. He saw urban slaves sold to rice planters. While reading the local newspapers, he came across the advertisements of masters who reported runaway slaves. He also read the advertisements which sold black men and women. Perhaps more importantly, he observed the subservient manner which both slaves and free blacks were forced to assume. Slavery was a vivid nightmare for Denmark Vesey, who could not forget his past or ignore the plight of the black majority of Charleston City.

Although Denmark Vesey was a free man, he was closely

connected with the slave community. At a time when countless free Negroes were trying to separate from the black masses and to cast their lot with the slave masters, he chose a radical alternative. Disregarding the opinions of white Charlestonians, who disapproved of interaction between free blacks and slaves, he associated with the servant class. His intimate friends were slaves. He worked with slaves. He attended the African Methodist Church, which had a congregation consisting of slaves and a few free blacks. But, more importantly, he sympathized with the slaves of Charleston. His commitment was so strong that he refused to emigrate to West Africa when free blacks like George Creighton supported the exodus and eventually left Charleston for the promised land. Vesey concluded that African repatriation could not solve the problems of the majority of black folk. Their plight would be the same.61 His concern about the slaves of Charleston was fervent, and he cast his lot with them.

What kept Denmark Vesey so committed to the slave community? The free black rebel was wealthy and lived a comfortable existence. Vesey himself recalled that he was contented with his life. But a very personal concern transformed him from a nonviolent opponent of slavery to a violent rebel who called for the destruction of slavery. Like many of the free blacks of Charleston, Vesey had family members who were slaves. Despite the wealth he accumulated, he could not acquire the freedom of loved ones. Perhaps he tried to buy the liberty of his wife and children but was turned down. Whatever the reasons that denied him the acquisition of loved ones, their bondage haunted him. As he saw his son grow from a small boy into manhood, his hatred of slavery intensified. Frustrated and embittered, the 55-year-old black man knew his life was gradually ending. He was old, but his children were young and had not tasted liberty. Furthermore, they would never be free if something drastic were not done. On a dark night in 1818, Denmark Vesey planned an insurrection which would free not only his family but all the slaves of Charleston. Appealing to the desire to have the comfort of one's wife and children, he persuaded slaves who were privileged bondsmen to join the revolution. As the cohorts of Vesey recalled, the revolution was for the children who might never be free. What made Denmark Vesey burn with such hatred that he planned to annihilate all of white Charleston was the simple love of a father for his children. His radicalism was born out of the desire to see loved ones freed from bondage. That love caused him to risk much, for greater than the risk was the anticipated reward-the liberty of his family and the black masses.66

One may ask, why did not the love of slave relations cause the other free Negroes of Charleston to join the ranks of the black rebel? Many of the elite Negroes had already obtained the freedom of one or more loved ones and firmly believed that their remaining kinsfolk would be freed. Others were accumulating the capital to purchase slave relatives and could not fathom such extreme actions. Even those of marginal means believed that through patience and hard work, they would acquire the freedom of loved ones. They saw hope in the dark clouds of despair. Yet hope made up of accomodation, compromise, and patience had not secured the family of Denmark Vesey. While most free Negroes were sustained by hope, Vesey felt frustration and desperation. Such feelings of hopelessness prompted radical measures, and violence was the last alternative. Had not the overwhelming majority of free black Charlestonians seen the light at the end of the tunnel, they might have chosen a radical course of action and joined Denmark Vesey. Despite having the privilege of freedom, if their loved ones could not have been purchased, they might have been receptive to the call for revolution. The security of family was worth the threat of death and would have made men and women like Thomas S. Bonneau, Maurice Brown, Sarah Edwards, Tissey Hawie, Lamb Stevens, and Ann Snelling the black Jacobins of Charleston.61

Since the right to purchase loved ones was firmly established in South Carolina, the stimulus needed to radicalize the free Negro community of Charleston was absent. Although Denmark Vesey could not buy the freedom of his loved ones, other free blacks did. White Charlestonians knew that the ownership of slaves gave free Negroes a stake in the system and the desire to preserve the old order. 68 Whether the slaves were kinsfolk or workers, the black masters seldom called for the overthrow of the Southern regime. Sharing a common interest in slaveownership with white Charlestonians, free Negroes were separated from the masses of black people. With a divided black majority, the peculiar institution was protected from servile rebellions. By and large, the Charleston of Denmark Vesey was a fragmented city where unity within the black community was impossible.

Chapter Ten

No More Black Massa

After the Civil War, free black masters no longer exploited the labor of slaves. As a consequence of the war, the black slaveowners were required to free their slaves; if they wanted to use the services of workers, they had to make the transition from slaves to employees. This transition was slow and difficult for the rural masters and marked the death of the plantation system. The collapse of the institution of slavery caused a decline in the amount of farm produce harvested by former slave masters. As the ex-slaves began to assert their freedom, few wanted to labor as they did before the war. As a result, farm production declined, as did land acquisition by former black masters. Furthermore, the problem of decreasing production was exacerbated by the devastation of the war and by bad planting weather. For these reasons, over 75 percent of the black slaveowners who cultivated farmland in 1859 were not planting in 1869. In fact, not one of the thirteen black masters who grew rice in 1859 planted the staple in 1869, and by 1879, only one former colored slaveowner cultivated rice in South Carolina. By and large, the war and the emancipation of the slaves caused the collapse of the black slaveowning class of rice planters as well as the large cotton planters.

Yet to the urban colored slaveholders, the death of slavery not only ended a way of life but created a new one. With the conclusion of the Civil War, many former slaveowners quickly adapted to the new economy and prospered without regretting their loss of slaves. Furthermore, the former colored slaveowners had several opportunities thrust upon them, and they cast aside their slaveholding past and entered a new world. Indeed, a few former slaveowners entered the arena of politics and were elected to public offices. But some former masters were bitter about the war and their loss of slaves. For them, the seeds of their destruction were sown during the years before the Civil War.

The political climate before the war was a threatening time for free blacks in South Carolina. As the patriots of the state were preparing for war, they began to question the loyalty and the mere existence of the free black community. Many South Carolinians saw the opportunity to rid their communities of free blacks and used the hysteria of the early 1860s to accomplish their goals. In December 1859, the state assembly debated the merits of a bill which would enslave all free blacks, if they did not leave the state by the first of March 1860.1 The prospered bill stipulated that the local sheriffs of

the several districts where free persons of color resided should sell them to the highest bidders if they did not take a master. Whether free blacks chose a master or were sold into bondage, they would be considered the property of their buyers; thus they would not be entitled to own property or even themselves. The proposed bill not only threatened the freedom of the free black community but would have eliminated the black slaveowning class; thus it caused great concern among the black masters.

In Charleston City, James D. Johnson, a free black slaveowner and a tailor, voiced his concern about the continued existence of the free black community in South Carolina. On April 20, 1860, he wrote to Henry Ellison, a colored master and a cotton planter of Sumter County, describing the atmosphere in Charleston City.2 James D. Johnson informed Henry Ellison that "the agitation has been so great as to cause many to leave who were liable to the law of 1822 and the panic has reached those whom that law cannot affect."' The concerns of Johnson were based on the first and seventh sections of the Act of 1822. The first section stipulated that all free persons of color who left South Carolina for any amount of time and returned to the state would be forced to leave their native soil or sold into bondage. The seventh section required that all free coloreds have a white person to serve as a guardian or they too would be forced into slavery. According to Johnson, the Negrophobia of 1860 caused the Charleston officials to strenuously enforce both sections of the statute. In fact, the colored tailor said that "there are cases [in which] persons who for 30 years [have been free] have to go back to bondage ... and for the consolation of those who are exempted we are told this is the beginning, the next session will windup the affairs of every free colored man and they will have to leave."4

Many colored residents of Charleston City shared the anxieties expressed by James D. Johnson. In fact, John Lee, a hotel owner of the city, said that "it is plain now all must go."' By December 1860, a group of colored persons were debating the merits of leaving the city and emigrating to Haiti. While some discussed the possibility of flight, others left the port city for the safety of the North. In the spring of 1860, James D. Johnson recalled that several free blacks were leaving the city and heading to the Keystone State.6 Johnson was so afraid that the situation would deteriorate that he concluded that "every property holder will be glad to take what he can get unrespective of the value of his property."' He feared that free black property owners would be forced to sell their real estate and slaves and flee from the state, because if the proposed bill was passed, they would lose their

property and freedom. By the summer of 1860, he gave in to his fears and fled from the city. On August 7, he departed for Toronto, Canada, where part of his family had resided for many years.'

Although the fears of James D. Johnson and many free blacks were legitimate, the bill to enslave the free colored community did not clear the Judicial Committee. The proposed bill was never voted on and remained in the committee. As James M. Johnson, the son of James D. Johnson, prophesied "nothing would be done affecting our position."9 He was quite right, because many colored persons were aligned with prominent white citizens who protected their privileges. In fact, the editors of the Charleston Mercury voiced their opposition to the proposed bill. On November 24, 1860, the editors declared that "we desire at once to enter our emphatic protest. We regard it as a measure harsh in its policy and wholly unrequired by the public exigencies ..."10 A few days later, several citizens of Charleston City joined the protest made by the Mercury and declared their disgust with the state assembly.

> To the Editor of the Charleston Mercury Permit us to join with you in your "emphatic protest" against the Free Negro bill published in your paper of Saturday. We do sincerely hope that a measure so full of oppression and injustice will never be found on the Statute books of South Carolina. For ourselves, we can see neither the policy nor the necessity of such legislation and think it well characterized by you as only "mischievous in its effects" and "ill timed" in its promolgation. It is no doubt true that we have bad free negroes amongst us, and so we have bad white men; but as we keep the latter in check so we can the former.
>
> But we have also a considerable number of colored persons in our community who are leading peacable, honest, and industrious lives and who have the confidence and esteem of our best citizens. Many of these have been born and grown up with us and we are as well acquainted with those of any other class. By honest and patient industry they have accumulated more or less of property and some of them are inquite comfortable circumstances ... consequently they have a stake in the welfare of the community and everything to lose by whatever trends to disturb or overthrew it.
>
> We regard them, therefore as a safe class of people, who will keep their eyes and ears open to give us warning of any

danger and we should be both sorry and ashamed to see an act of the legislature passed to reduce them to slavery or to drive them with ruinous haste from our borders ..."

Many prominent citizens like Christopher Gustavious Memminger, an influential lawyer and politician of Charleston County, believed that the free black community served a useful role and protected the interest of slaveowners. Since many of the well-to-do colored persons were slave masters and landholders, the whites concluded that the free black elite would join them in support of the institution of slavery. At the outbreak of the Civil War, the lines were drawn by the free black populace and the views of white supporters of the colored community seemed accurate.'2

On April 12, 1861, the threat to the colored masters was not the Negrophobia of the previous year, but the prospect of war. It was on that date that the attack on Fort Sumter occurred and the beginning stages of the Civil War had started. The black masters saw the opportunity to affirm their commitment to South Carolina and sided with the white slaveowners. A group of free blacks from Charleston City, including a number of colored slaveowners, issued the following statement: "in our veins flows the blood of the white race, in some half, in others much more than half ... our attachments are with you, our hopes and safety and protection from you ... our allegiance is due to South Carolina and in her defense, we will offer up our lives, and all that is dear to us."13 The sentiments of the Charleston black slaveowners were shared by the black masters of other counties. For example, William Ellison, a cotton planter and the owner of 63 slaves, offered his aid to the Confederate Army in Sumter County. According to Thomas S. Sumter, a resident of Sumter County, the sons of William Ellison offered their services to the Confederacy, but were not allowed to enter the army because of their color.14

As the Confederate Army began to make successful advances in the summer of 1862, the black masters continued their farming operations with slave labor. However, like their white counterparts, the black masters were faced with the dilemma of declining cotton production. In the rebelling Southern states, production went from 4.5 million bales in 1861 to 1.5 million bales in 1862, largely as a result of the war economy, which stressed the cultivation of corn and other foodstuffs rather than cotton. The naval blockade by the Union forces and the lack of adequate capital also contributed to the decline. Indeed, even before the blockade became successful, the Confederate government withheld all cotton from the Southern ports. The Southern leaders believed that if they restricted the exportation of the staple,

the European nations would provide the South with military aid in order to maintain the supply of cotton. Even when the supply of cotton was moderate, the planters could not ship their crops to foreign markets. For example, in the winter of 1860-1861, Henry Ellison of Sumter County kept in storage 100 bales of cotton that he could not sell because of the restrictions of the war."

By 1863 it was becoming apparent to the black masters that it was only a matter of time before their valuable slave property would be freed. Even before President Lincoln issued his Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863, he declared his intentions of freeing the slaves in the rebellious Southern states if the South did not cease in the military campaign against the North. The proposed emancipation by the president was met with vicious opposition from Southerners. In November 1862, Governor Francis W. Pickens of South Carolina declared that "the infamous proclamation" would "produce none of the effects intended by its vulgar author." Yet the fear that the proclamation would lead to the de facto emancipation of the slaves was apparent when he said that "to protect ourselves from any effort instigated by the deluded or ignorant I would urge the immediate organization of a large State Police Guard under the direct command of the Governor, to be ordered out at such times and in such Districts as he may think proper, to be kept at least for some months in actual daily duty to give a feeling of safety to the helpless."16 Many Southerners feared that the Emancipation Proclamation would cause their slaves to take their freedom. But until the Union forces were within striking distance, prospects of actual emancipation were remote.

As the tide of the war changed, the hopes for a Southern victory were becoming less of a reality. With the Confederate Army's failure at Gettysburg, the Confederacy had lost its offensive thrust and was forced to fight a defensive war which could only result in the defeat of the South.

As the war began to turn, so did the fortunes of the black masters. Clearly, the war made life difficult and harsh on the farms and plantations owned by colored slaveholders. Shortages of food and clothing became common on most plantations. In many areas of the state, there were shortages of salt which affected the ration of meat because the planters could not preserve their food over a great length of time. In March 1864, for example, Henry Ellison, a colored cotton planter from Sumter County, was confronted with a shortage of salt. In order to receive a supply of salt, he solicited the aid of a colored friend in Charleston City.

Many of the slaveowners were the victims of either the Confederate or the Union soldiers, who pillaged their livestock and caused many of the shortages. In Charleston County, Sarah Boag, a free black and a slaveowner, lost nearly all of her livestock during the war years. Before the conflict between the states, she owned 25 cows, 45 sheep, 70 swine, and 75 head of cattle, but after the Civil War, all her remaining livestock consisted of a single mule, 3 cows, and 3 working oxen.

As the war raged on, shortages of meat and other foodstuffs were not the only dilemma faced by the colored masters. Even the wealthiest colored masters could not always purchase clothing for their families and slaves. Quite often the slave masters employed their female slaves to make homespun clothing. Yet a few masters were able to buy their clothing from merchants in Charleston City. In 1864, Selina Wilkinson bought a calico dress for $30 and in that same year, a pair of shoes for $40."

As the colored slaveowners saw the effects of shortages reduce their farm and plantation operations, there were few, if any, who did not question the existence of the peculiar institution and their role as slaveowners. Many black masters began to reassess that role. Others sought to liquidate their human chattel. In the summer of 1863, Joseph Sasportas, a butcher of Charleston City, sold his 40-year-old slave named Maria to Fanny Northrop for $300. Surely the concerns of Joseph Sasportas caused him to sell one of his six slaves when the tide of the war began to turn. Other colored slaveowners liquidated all of their slave property that they held before the Union Army forced them to emancipate their slaves." In January of 1863, the administrators of the deceased William W. Seymour sold for $3,080 the following three slaves: Allen, 20 years old; Diana, 18 years old; and Joe, 10 years old. After the sale, the money was divided between the deceased man's children. Apparently, the administrators of the deceased believed that it was unwise to divide the slaves themselves between Seymour's heirs, because if the South lost the war, they would be relieved of their property without compensation. As the war continued to worsen for the Confederacy, other colored masters probably attempted to sell their slave property but could not find a willing buyer because the Union Army was advancing towards South Carolina. 19

Yet even as the Confederacy was falling into disarray, many of the black masters refused to sell their slaves, while others chose not to grant their servants nominal freedom. As late as 1864, there were 81 colored slave masters who owned 241 slaves in Charleston City. Many of these slaveowners used their slaves as workers and did not intend

to emancipate them. In July 1864, for example, Selina Wilkinson, the widow of Francis L. Wilkinson, placed her servants in the local workhouse when the rumors of their impending emancipation caused discontent among them. Even well into the war years, several free blacks acquired slaves for the first time. In 1863, Abigail H. Anderson, a 17-year-old washerwoman, obtained two slaves and paid taxes amounting to $6. Other slaveowners who did not own slaves until after 1862 were as follows: Ann Benjamin, four slaves; Amelia L. Cornwell, four slaves; Rose Hill, one slave; Eliza Ann Portee, one slave; William Purse, two slaves; and Charles Walker, two slaves.20 Although many of the slave acquisitions during the 1860s were exploitative, there were free blacks who purchased slaves for humanitarian reasons. On January 1, 1863, John Nelson, a free black of Charleston City, purchased his daughter Josephine from John S. Ryan for $500. Even after the Emancipation Proclamation was signed by President Abraham Lincoln and the decree went into effect, free blacks continued to purchase slaves. On January 20, 1863, John L. Francis, a free black and a barber of Charleston City, bought a 10-year-old slave boy named Joe for $500. By 1864, four new slaveowners were added to the tax list of colored persons who paid duties on slave property. These colored slave masters were Susan Curry, one slave; Maria Holwell, one slave; William Grant, one slave; and Theresa Maxwell, three slaves. Apparently, free blacks were not inhibited from buying slaves even as the collapse of the rebelling South appeared imminent.31

By the autumn of 1864, the troops of General William T. Sherman were advancing toward South Carolina. In addition, Union forces of some 5,000 men were ordered from the islands off the coast of South Carolina to facilitate Sherman's advance. As the Union forces were preparing to invade the city of Charleston, the Confederate Army began hastily burning military stores. When the cloud of smoke began to rise, the Union leaders on the Sea Islands concluded that the Confederate troops were fleeing the city. They therefore ordered their soldiers to occupy the Confederate stronghold. Among the invading troops were the Twenty-First U.S. Colored Troops. When they reached the city, a crowd of jubilant free blacks and slaves greeted the soldiers; but the colored masters of Charleston perceived the invasion as apocalyptic destruction rather than salvation.22

By the winter and early spring of 1865, other strongholds where black masters resided had fallen to the Union Army. In February 1865, Georgetown County was taken by the Union troops. Then Sumter County, where the large black planters lived, fell in April 1865. As the Union soldiers marched through South Carolina, they wreaked havoc

and destruction within the following counties: Camden, Cheraw, Chesterfield, Darlington, Lancaster, Lexington, Orangeburgh, Richland, and Winns boro. By the end of the spring, South Carolina was under the control of the Union Army, and the job of reconstructing the state had begun.21

As a result of the problems caused by the war, the Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen and Abandoned Lands was established in March 1865. The Bureau attempted to aid the freedmen who were plagued by the dislocation caused by the war and shortages of food and to assist the slaves in signing labor contracts. The Bureau also aided the planters by providing them with supplies to feed their former slaves. Upon the conclusion of the war, many colored planters were unable to grow enough foodstuffs for their families or former slaves."

Without the assistance of the Freedmen's Bureau, the family and former slaves of Robert Michael Collins, a colored rice planter from Georgetown County, would surely have starved. As a result of the devastation of the war and the pillage of his plantation, he was unable to feed his former slaves. The failure of the rice crops of 1865, 1866, and 1867 complicated the problem. In fact, on March 14, 1867, a Freedmen's Bureau official reported that "the last two years most of the rice crops have failed some in some part others entirely and now I am afraid that some of the planters cannot without great sacrifice feed their laborers ..."2S His observations were quite correct, but for Robert Michael Collins, the situation did not worsen until the summer of 1868. As a result of his food shortages, he was forced to seek aid for his laborers and their families from the Bureau.

On June 30, 1868, the agency issued one month of rations, which consisted of 21.5 bushels of corn and 105 pounds of bacon, to Robert Michael Collins. The amount of food issued suggests that at least two or three families remained on the Santee Plantation, which had numbered 17 slaves before the Civil War. The rations sent to Collins were not an act of benevolence by the federal government, but a loan which had to be repaid. Indeed, a bill was sent along with the supplies for the amount of $49.53. Collins attempted to plant rice to fulfill his financial obligation.26

In spite of the small sum of money owed by Robert Michael Collins, he could not repay the loan. On October 19, 1868, Wesley Markwood, the clerk of the local Freedmen's Bureau of Georgetown, wanted to know when the crop of Mr. Collins would be ready for market in order that his debts could be paid. By December 10, 1868, the debt was still unpaid, and Wesley Markwood sent another letter

informing Collins that his account should be cleared by the 25th of December. Unfortunately for Collins, bad planting weather had destroyed much of his rice crop, forcing him to rely upon the sale of wood from the Santee Plantation to sustain himself and dependents. Consequently he could not fulfill his meager debt of $52.48.27 On December 30, 1868, he wrote to Wesley Markwood explaining the dilemma he faced. Collins said, "I am truly sorry that I have not been able to meet you at this appointed time owning to the inclemency of the weather I could not haul my wood enough to make up the balance will call and settle up."2" He concluded the letter by asking for more time to pay his debt.

In the spring of 1869, Robert Michael Collins began to repay the loan. On April 18th, Henry F. Heriot, the clerk of the local agency of Georgetown, reported that Collins had fulfilled part of his debts to the Bureau when he paid $35 of the $52.48 he owed. His complete fulfillment of the debt took one year to accomplish.19

After the war, Collins, like other planters, found his plantation in disarray. Before he could start to rebuild his estate, he needed capital to purchase seeds for planting and other necessities. The postwar years were distressing times, and money was scarce. Many planters were forced into debt when they acquired the capital to plant rice. Consequently, many planters could not quickly recover from the devastations of the war.

Rebuilding the plantation of Robert Michael Collins was a slow and arduous task. By 1870, his plantation was a mere shadow of what the estate had been before the war. In 1860, the plantation was worked by 11 field hands, who produced 100 bushels of Indian corn, 1,000 bushels of sweet potatoes, and 90,000 pounds of rice. In addition, there were 2 oxen, 3 horses, 3 cows, 10 cattle, 10 sheep, and 30 swine on the rice plantation. But the war reduced the crops and the livestock to a fraction of the antebellum numbers. In 1870, the plantations yielded 50 bushels of Indian corn, 100 bushels of sweet potatoes, and no rice. All that remained of the livestock were 2 oxen, 3 horses, 7 swine, 8 cows, and 10 cattle, together valued at $360. Clearly his reduced farm produce and depleted livestock did not allow him to make enough money to pay his workers, and he produced barely enough food to sustain them.30

The former slaves of Robert Michael Collins worked the land, not for wages, but for food, shelter, and clothing. In fact, the census of 1870 did not report any wages paid to his workers. Like many of the planters in South Carolina, Collins was affected by the shortage of

capital which existed throughout the state. The transactions between Collins and his workers were based on the mutual needs of the two parties. For Collins, the former slaves provided the labor to till the soil. They also cut down trees on the plantation to be sold, providing a steady source of revenue. In return for their labor, the former slaves were allotted food and clothing. In essence, the labor contract between the two parties resembled the system of work during slavery. According to Eugene Genovese, the system of slavery was based on mutual needs and obligations. The slave masters provided their bondsmen with food, shelter, and clothing; the slaves gave their labor in return. The major difference between the antebellum arrangements and the Reconstruction contracts was the distinction between the forced labor of slavery and the quasi-voluntary system which developed after slavery. Many of the former slaves could leave their current employers and work for other planters."

By 1880, Robert Michael Collins' contracts with his former slaves had turned away from the antebellum system of mutual obligations and toward a wage system. According to the census of 1880, he paid his laborers $1,000 for the year of 1879. In exchange for their wages, the exslaves produced 20 bushels of cow peas, 20 bushels of apples, 100 bushels of potatoes, 200 bushels of Indian corn, and 4,050 pounds of rice. Also the former slaves chopped $600 worth of wood. After nearly 15 years of struggling, the plantation of Robert Michael Collins finally began to resemble the plantation of 1860.32

The cost of resurrecting Collins' plantation was paid in land. The plantation withered from 3,100 acres in 1870 to 1,480 acres in 1880, a decrease of 1,620 acres, or 52.2 percent. Even so, the plantation was more productive than at any time since the Civil War and demonstrated that the wage system could be successful and profitable. By 1880, Collins was the only black rice planter who had regained a semblance of the past glory of the antebellum period."

Most black rice planters could not recover from the collapse of slavery and the devastation of the war. In 1860, Andrew James Anderson owned a plantation which consisted of 663 acres of land and produced 300 bushels of sweet potatoes, 400 bushels of Indian corn, and 13,200 pounds of rice. Upon the emancipation of his slaves, he decided to sell the rice plantation and leave the parish of St. Thomas & St. Dennis. It was not until February of 1867 that he found someone to purchase the plantation. In that year, he sold Bulls Head Plantation to Aaron Logan for $1,333.34 and moved to Georgetown County, to a plot of land not far from his cousin, Robert Michael Collins. Apparently, Anderson became disillusioned by the war and no longer

wanted to plant rice. In another example, the census of 1870 shows that Sarah Boag, a colored woman of St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish of Charleston District, did not recover from the losses she sustained after the Civil War. As a result of the defeat of the Confederacy, Mrs. Boag lost $6,000 worth of slave property-ten slaves, who had produced 6,000 pounds of rice in 1859. She could not plant rice without her slaves. The Civil War had so disrupted the operations of her farm that 312 acres of land remained idle.34 With her income from farming eliminated, Mrs. Boag relied on her occupation as a midwife as well as the sale of milk to support herself in 1869. In that same year, Janet Collins, the sister of Sarah Boag, owned 132 acres of land which lay fallow. Yet, in 1860, her slaves had tilled the soil and produced 150 bushels of Indian corn, 800 bushels of sweet potatoes, and 10,000 pounds of rice. Janet Collins and Sarah Boag, like the majority of the colored slaveowners who planted rice, found that the war had left them with little ability or will to reconstruct their plantations."

During the Reconstruction period, the largest colored cotton planter in South Carolina shared the same gloomy fate as the colored rice farmers. In the late 1860s, the estate of William Ellison suffered a slow and painful death. Before the war, Ellison Plantation numbered 800 acres of land and was worked by 44 field hands, who cultivated 80 bales of cotton, 200 bushels of peas, 1,000 bushels of sweet potatoes, and 2,000 bushels of Indian corn in 1859. After the war, the former slaves remaining on the plantation improved only 80 acres of land, which yielded 5 bales of cotton, 10 bushels of Irish potatoes, 50 bushels of peas, and 460 bushels of Indian corn in 1869. Unfortunately, even that recovery was only monetary, and the output had declined even further by 1879. In that year, the former slaves of the colored farmer cultivated 6 bales of cotton, 15 bushels of peas, 50 bushels of potatoes, and 50 bushels of Indian corn. The reduced production of Ellison Plantation suggests that the slaves felt no obligation to help rebuild the estate and left the plantation to pursue their own lives.36

With the defeat of the Confederacy, Henry Ellison, the son of William Ellison and the manager of his father's estate, knew that the plantation economy was dead, and he sought other means of making a livelihood. In order to augment the revenue earned from the plantation, he invested the capital acquired into a general store, which served the exslaves and whites of Stateburg township in Sumter County during the 1880s.37

While many former slave masters discontinued their farming

operations, others expanded their output in spite of the disruption caused by the Civil War. Henry Glencamp, a 65-year-old mulatto of St. Stephen's Parish in Charleston County, reconstructed his farm and even increased the output. In 1859, for example, the slaves of Glencamp had picked 2 bales of cotton and harvested 200 bushels of Indian corn. A decade later, his former slaves cultivated 3 bales of cotton and 300 bushels of Indian corn. In Beaufort County, William Jones hired his former slaves to cultivate 12 bales of cotton and 15 bushels of Indian corn in 1869. In 1859, his slaves had grown only 7 bales of cotton. However, while William Jones planted more cotton than was grown before the war, he did not produce enough agricultural goods to feed his former slaves. In 1869, he was forced to seek aid from the Freedmen's Bureau. Between May and June of 1869, he received 41 bushels of corn and 306 pounds of meat from the agency to feed his workers.3'

For most colored planters, the process of rebuilding plantations took a long period of time. In 1859, Wade Sanders, a free black of Newberry County, used slaves to work his farm. With the labor of slaves, his farm yielded 100 bushels of peas, 100 bushels of sweet potatoes, 600 bushels of corn, and 23 bales of cotton. After the war, he hired his former slaves to cultivate 7 bales of cotton and 170 bushels of corn.39 In exchange for the labor of his former slaves, he paid them $986 for the year of 1869. The profits extracted from the farm allowed him to purchase at public auction a 175-acre tract of land for $1,000 in 1872. By the post-Reconstruction era, the farm of Wade Sanders was more productive than during the antebellum period when he had utilized the labor of slaves. In 1879, he employed agricultural laborers to cultivate 31 bales of cotton, 38 bushels of wheat, 100 bushels of oats, and 400 bushels of Indian corn. Within 14 years after the conclusion of the Civil War, Wade Sanders' farm produced more cotton than he had grown using the labor of slaves in 1859.40

Planters like Sanders were the exception rather than the rule. After the death of the peculiar institution, most of the former slaveowning planters of African ancestry were devastated, and few recaptured the success of the antebellum era. Clearly, their livelihood had benefitted so much from slavery that when the institution was destroyed, they could not recover and rebuild their plantations and farms.

After the Civil War, the colored urbanites of Charleston City were forced to free their slaves, but the end of slavery did not destroy their livelihood. With the elimination of chattel slavery, the colored slave

masters adapted to the wage labor system and hired workers. For instance, Edward Palmer, a colored brick mason who owned slaves in 1864, hired George Mooting (a 42-year-old laborer) to work as an assistant in 1870." While most of the colored artisans hired former slaves to be employed in their trades, others acquired the services of their offspring. In 1870, Francis Plummeau, a former slaveowner and a mechanic, apprenticed his son Alexander Plummeau to provide him with assistance in the family business. For the most part, the colored slaveowners of Charleston City were not heavily dependent on slavery during the early 1860s, and so they made the adjustment from slave labor to wage labor with only minor difficulties.42

Although the colored slaveowners of Charleston City lost about $216,900 in slave property when they were forced to free their bondsmen, the former slave masters retained a considerable amount of wealth. Prior to the war, most of the colored slaveowners had diversified their slaveholding by investing in real estate. Several slaveowners, including Malcolm Brown, Joseph Dereef, Richard E. Dereef, John L. Francis, Robert Howard, James Drayton Johnson, and Maria Weston, rented houses for a handsome fee. In 1854, for example, Charlotte A. Carmand, a colored woman and a slaveowner of Charleston City, received $540 for renting her two houses on Morris Street and Henrietta Street for 12 months. Many of the colored slaveowners relied on their investments in real estate when the war ended their exploitation of slave labor. In 1864, for example, Robert Howard, a free mulatto of Charleston City, owned real estate valued at $29,800 and 12 slaves who were worth $10,800. Even though he lost his slave property without compensation, he retained his real estate, which in 1870 was appraised at $30,000 and rented for a considerable sum of money. Elsewhere in the city, Anthony Weston, a 79-year-old millwright of African ancestry, lost 14 slaves who were valued at $12,600. His real estate depreciated by $11,500, but he retained property worth $30,000 in 1870. His estate consisted of several houses which were rented to the citizens of Charleston City, providing him a steady source of revenue in 1870."

Unlike the freedmen of South Carolina, the colored slaveowners of Charleston City entered the postwar era with property, education, and status, which contributed to their success during the Reconstruction and the post-Reconstruction periods. Indeed, many of the mulatto slaveowners separated themselves from the masses of black folk and attempted to establish a caste system based on color, wealth, and free status before the war. According to Martin Delany, the colored community of Charleston City clung to the assumptions of the superiority of white blood and brown complexion. These

mulattoes of the old free Negro elite did not attend church with the dark-skinned folk of Charleston City. They not only formed congregations which excluded freedmen of dark complexion, but married among themselves and imitated the white aristocrats of the port city. In 1870, for example, George Shrewsberry, a well-to-do mulatto and a former slaveowner, employed two black domestic servants to wait on his family. By 1874 Shrewsberry was elected to the city council of Charleston and described as a very conservative man by the Charleston Daily Courier. Many of the former slaveholding persons of African ancestry not only separated themselves from the community of blackskinned freedmen, but aligned themselves with the Old Guard of the white community."

Yet the children of the mulatto slaveowners seemed to be more willing to bridge the gap between light-skinned and dark-skinned people of color. Indeed, many of the colored leaders came from the slaveowning families of Charleston City. Since many of the daughters and sons of the black masters were educated, they used their knowledge to teach the freedmen how to read and write. During the late 1860s, Frances Rollins, the daughter of William Rollins, a colored slaveowner of Charleston City, worked as a schoolteacher in Beaufort County.4 Miss Rollins was educated at the Institution for Colored Youth in Philadelphia and was one of four sisters who worked to uplift the freedmen of South Carolina. After her service as a schoolteacher in Beaufort County, she married William James Whipper, a state representative of South Carolina. Other offspring from the slaveholding class of free blacks also assisted in the education of their race. Shortly after the war, Thaddeus Sasportas, the son of Joseph A. Sasportas, a mulatto slaveowner, went to Orangeburgh County to aid the ex-slaves and worked as a teacher. Thaddeus Sasportas not only taught the freedmen how to read and write, but provided political leadership. At the age of 24, he served as a delegate to the constitutional convention of 1868. He later was elected to the state legislature and represented the black constituency of Orangeburgh County.46

When the franchise was given to black males, several of the offspring of colored masters filled the ranks of the elected officials in South Carolina. In 1870, Florian H. Frost of Williamsburgh County, the son of Lydia Frost, a slaveowner of Charleston City, was elected to the state house of representatives and served until his death in 1872. During the Reconstruction and post-Reconstruction eras, 2 out of 8 black congressmen were from slaveholding colored families of South Carolina. After serving in the state senate, Joseph Rainey, the son of

Edward Rainey, a slaveowner of Georgetown County, was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1870. Rainey subsequently served four straight terms, and during his tenure, he frequently spoke in favor of education and social advances for blacks. At the beginning of Rainey's second term, the colored people of South Carolina also elected Robert DeLarge to the Congress." Robert DeLarge was the son of a slaveholding tailor named John DeLarge and served as the state land commissioner of South Carolina before he was elected to the U.S. House of Representa- tives.48

As the collapse of the Confederacy submerged the mulatto slave owners in a sea of blackness, the former slave masters attempted to reconstruct their farms, plantations, and trades. At the same time, they separated themselves from the black masses through social exclusion. But the children of these colored slaveowners were not as susceptible to the prejudices of their parents, and they tried to bridge the gap between mulattoes and blacks as well as the gap between slave masters and slaves, thus creating a unified community of black folks.

Appendix A

Tables for Chapter One

Table A-1. Free Black Slaveowners Reported on the Federal Census with Documentation of Slaveownership in Charleston City, South Carolina, 1830.

*Listed as free person of color in document

Slaveowner	Transaction documented
1. John Cain	Sold a black woman named Catey for $100 in 1843
2. Francoise Perrier*	Sold a black woman named Orphia and her infant for $550 in 1821
3. Moses Brown	Advertised for a runaway slave named Moses in 1826
4. George Wilson*	Asked the state senate to free his family in 1835
5. John Brown*	Bought a black woman named Mauddy for $300 in 1816
6. William Cooper*	Bought a black woman named Lucretia and her child for $470 in 1827
7. Hannah Duprat	Bought Silvia, a 13-year-old black girl, for $350 in 1824
8. Benjamin Huger	Sold a black man named Moses for $330 in 1831
9. Thomas Inglis	Sold Liddy, a 20-year-old mulatto, for $450 in 1830
10. Moses Irvine*	Asked the state senate to free his family in 1836
11. Ann May	Bought Sukey for $300 in 1812
12. John McBeath	Sold Harriet and her child David for $450 in 1829
13. John Lee	Mortgaged four slaves for $3,200 in 1837
14. William W. Seymour	Mortgaged eight slaves for $4,040 in 1839
15. Rosette Summers	Requested that her slaves be sold in 1840
16. Lydia Watson	Sold Isaac, a carpenter, for $450 in 1827
17. George Mathews*	Sold Peggy (because of unpaid workhouse fees) in 1827
18. Camilla Johnson	Sold Diana Todd, a mulatto servant, in 1833

19. Hetty Hannahan*	Bought Bob, a 35-year-old mulatto, from Virginia for $400 in 1811
20. Jane Brown	Sold Daphne for $500 in 1829
21. Sylvia Ball*	Bought Silvia and her child Rachel for $850 in 1818
22. Maria Buckle*	Bought a black man named Tom for $450 in 1814
23. Barbara Barquet	Sold Peter, a 20-year-old man, to her daughter for $1 in 1835
24. Maria Creighton	Gave nominal freedom to slave Leah in 1821
25. Sarah Ferguson*	Sold Ponder, a 35-year-old black woman, for $190 in 1823
26. Rachel Jackson*	Requested that her slaves be sold in 1835
27. Catherine Jacobs	Bought a slave woman named Mary for $280 in 1808
28. John B. Mathews	Bought Sarah and her children James and William for $500 in 1820
29. Peter B. Mathews	Bought a black woman named Ferrette for $80 in 1830
30. Smart Simpson*	Bought two slaves named Prince and Rachel for $600 in 1813
31. Mary Smith*	Requested that her slave be sold in 1839
32. Carlos Smith	Bought a black man named James for $455 in 1825
33. Rebecca Thorne*	Received wages from hired-out slaves during the 1830s
34. Rebecca Bremar*	Bought Harrietta, a black girl, for $350 in 1824
35. Malcolm Brown	Sold Isabella and her daughter for $1,000 in 1839
36. Abraham Ashe*	Died in the possession of three slaves valued at $650 in 1843
37. Joseph Barelli*	Sold Charlotte and her boy James Crawly for $850 in 1829
38. Hagar Cole	Mortgaged Betsey and her infant Mary Ann for $370 in 1840
39. Susan Drayton*	Bought Willoughty, a 58-year-old female, for $200 in 1830
40. Priscilla Duverse*	Bought a black man named Pompey for $300 in 1829
41. Julia Ezzart*	Bought a 17-year-old girl named Grace for $400 in 1821
42. John L. Francis	Sold three slaves named Betty, Louis, and Edward for $800 in 1829
43. Simon Groning*	Bought a 30-year-old male named Carlos for $300 in 1820
44. Martha Garden	Sold a 36-year-old woman named Jane for $450 in 1837
45. Joseph Humphrey	Sold Jim for $321 in 1827
46. Richard Holloway, Sr.	Sold a black woman named Jinne for $450 in 1834
47. James D. Johnson*	Bought a 19-year-old boy named Billy for $650 in 1837
48. Jehu Jones, Jr.	Sold a mulatto woman named Elsey for $750 in 1818

49. Sarah Johnston	Sold a black man named Tom for $400 in 1824
50. Richmond Kinloch	Requested the sale of his servant Peggy in 1839
51. Antonet Langlois	Sold a female slave named Sylvanie for $300 in 1834
52. Elsey Lee*	Received wages from her hired-out slaves during the 1830s and 1840s
53. Maria Lord	Sold a black woman named Molly or Lotty for $400 in 1823
54. Henry Liston*	Purchased a 70-year-old slave named Tom for $1 in 1824
55. Ann Mitchell	Sold a 15-year-old boy named Sampson for $300 in 1827
56. Priscilla North	Bought two brown boys named Henry and John for $190 in 1831
57. Vensus Roberts	Bought a black man named Isaac for $67.70 in 1842
58. Thomas Small, Sr.*	Bought a 17-year-old mulatto boy named Richard for $425 in 1825
59. Margaret Shaw	Sold a mulatto woman named Elsey for $750 in 1818
60. Philide Turner*	Bought Celia and her mulatto child Maria for $500 in 1810
61. Samuel Weston*	Bought Rachel Beard and her children Georgiana and Martha for $700
62. Fanny Graham*	Sold Ive or Joseph for $200 in 1834

Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Fifth Census of the United States, 1830: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, pp. 6, 8, 22, 28, 30, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 40, 43, 49, 50, 52-57, 61, 63, 72, 74, 75, 78, 82, 88, 90-100, 103, 107, 108, 111, 112; Bills of Sale vol. SD 1825-1827 (Secretary of State), p. 458; Ibid., vol. 4V 1820-1822, p. 225; Charleston Courier, January 21, 1826; Journal of the Senate of South Carolina for 1835, p. 43; Bills of Sale vol. 4M 1816-1818, p. 225; Ibid., vol. 5G 1827-1829, p. 133; Ibid., vol. 5A 1823-1825, p. 293; Ibid., vol. 5K 1829-1832, pp. 296, 530; Journal of the Senate of South Carolina for 1836, p. 24; Bills of Sale vol. 4D 1810-1811, p. 235; Ibid.. vol. 4F 1811-1813, pp. 117, 153, 192, 476; Ibid., vol. 41 1813-1815, p. 166; Ibid., 4P 1817, p. 467; Ibid., vol. 4S 1819-1820, pp. 80, 388; Ibid., vol. 4V 1820-1822, p. 134; Ibid., 4X 1822-1823, p. 383; Ibid., vol. 5A 1823-1825, pp. 190, 130, 282, 312, 511, 548; Ibid., vol. 5G 1827-1829, pp. 58, 104, 116, 136, 131, 275, 500; Ibid., vol. 5K 1829-1832, pp. 24, 128, 136, 308, 501, 48; Ibid., vol. 50 1832-1836, pp. 489, 498; Ibid., vol. ST 1836-1839, pp. 192, 304, 559; Ibid., vol. SW 1839-1843, p. 518; Mortgages vol. 4A 1840-1841 (South Carolina), p. 241; Ibid., vol. 4B 1841-1848, p. 63; Ibid., vol. 4Z 1836-1840, p. 293; Record of Wills vol. 39 1826-1834 (Charleston County), p. 1176; Ibid., vol. 42

1839-1840, pp. 214, 260, 864; Ibid., vol. 46 1851-1856, p. 46; Charleston Mercury, November 26, 1833; Miscellaneous Records vol. 5Z 1842-1843 (Secretary of State), p. 257; Ibid., vol. SQ 1834-1839, p. 125; Inventories vol. A 1839-1844 (Charleston County), p. 434; Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1848 Number 22; Ibid., 1851 no. 81; Bills of Sale vol. 5W 1839-1843 (Secretary of State), p. 590.

Table A-2. Free Black Slaveholders Reported on the Federal Census with Documentation of Slaveownership in Charleston City, South Carolina, 1840.

Slaveowner	Transaction documented
1. Barbara Barquet	At her request, Isaac, Bella and Diana sold for $1,350.40 in 1846
2. John Cain	Died in the possession of two slaves who were valued at $450 in 1844
3. Juliana Izard*	Inherited a slave named Bob, from her husband, Samuel Izard, in 1848
4. Edward Lee	Mortgaged a slave named Edwin for $1,400 in 1840
5. Jane Wightman	Requested that eight slaves be given to Henry Gosken in 1844
6. James Johnston	Purchased Isabella (a young mulatto) for $800 in 1840
7. William W. Seymour	Mortgaged five slaves for $1,431 in 1841
8. George Watkins or Wilson*	Petitioned state assembly to free his slave family in 1835
9. Hannah Humphrey	Received wages from hired-out slaves from 1848 to 1855
10. Rosey Summers	At her request, her slaves were sold for $1,270.13 in 1841
11. Betsey Walker*	Mortgaged a slave named Margaret for $800 in 1842
12. William Cooper	Provided nominal freedom for a slave named W.G. Cooper in 1841
13. Emma McCall	Purchased a nine-year-old girl named Agnes for $250 in 1839
14. Mose Irvine*	Petitioned state assembly to emancipate his wife and children in 1836
15. Joseph Williams	Sold a slave named Harry (a millwright) for $1,000 in 1839
16. Thomas Izard*	Sold a slave named Lewis (16 years old) for $300 in 1842
17. Emineline Jones	Purchased two slaves named Eliza and Septima for $900 in 1844
18. Sam Mathews	Filed a claim for the slaves Dye and her child in 1841
19. Martha Inglis	Requested that her servant March be given to her son in 1842
20. Ann Duprat	Purchased a 13-year-old servant girl named Silvia for $350 in 1824
21. Julia Cox*	Purchased Bess, a black woman, for $325 in 1844
22. John B. Mathews	Provided nominal freedom for a slave family in 1828
23. Eliza Walker	Sold a black woman named Jemima for $425 in 1834

24. Ann Walker	Received wages from seven slaves who were hired out in 1840
25. Eliza Stewart	Purchased an 80-year-old slave named Hagar for $100 in 1837
26. John St. Mark	Mortgaged two slaves named Willington & Francis for $240 in 1841
27. Emanuel Penceel	Inherited two slaves named Joe and Tom from his father in 1825
28. William P. DaCosta	Sold Thomas and Billy for $1,000 in 1844
29. Sarah Weston	Received Rose, a 27-year-old servant woman, from her son as a gift
30. Samuel Weston*	Purchased Ellen and her daughter Georgianna for $300 in 1841
31. Priscilla North	Purchased two slave boys named Henry and John for $190 in 1831
32. William McKinlay*	Purchased a slave family for $1,160.60 in 1836
33. Susan Marshall	Sold Christiana, a 20-year-old woman, for $420 in 1846
34. Richard Holloway	Sold Sarah and her children Edward and Annette for $945 in 1837
35. Ann May	Died in the possession of Matilda and her four children in 1848
36. Fanny Graham*	Provided the nominal freedom for a slave named Ive in 1834
37. Caroline Lubet	Purchased a 26-year-old slave named Elizabeth for $425 in 1846
38. Joseph P. Humphrey	Received Peter, a 20-year-old male, as a gift from his mother-in-law
39. Mary Mushington	Sold Peter, a colored boy, for $200 in 1845
40. John L. Francis	Sold Betty, Louis and Edward for $800 in 1829
41. James D. Johnson	Sold Florence, a mulatto boy, for $660 in 1842
42. Mary Smith*	Requested the sale of Polly in 1839
43. Jacob Weston	Purchased Clarissa for $225 in 1840
44. Phileda Turner	Sold Celia for $300 in 1825
45. Sally Johnson	Placed a notice for a runaway slave named Hestor in 1826
46. W.B. Clarke	Mortgaged Louisa and her three children for $2,000 in 1839
47. Thomas Cole	Mortgaged Betsey and her infant for $370 in 1840
48. Richmond Kinlock	Requested that his servant named Peggy be sold in 1839
49. Phoebe Lewis	Sold Jane, an 18-year-old woman, for $750 in 1849
50. Margaret Holten	Sold Eliza, a black woman, for $1,000 in 1856

Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, *Sixth Census of the United States, 1840: Schedule I*, Charleston City, South Carolina, pp. 9, 14, 15, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24, 29, 31, 33, 35, 41, 44, 53, 57, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 74, 77, 78, 85, 86, 87, 88, 91, 92; Bills of Sale vol. 5A 1823–1825 (Secretary of State), pp. 293, 364; *Ibid.*, vol. 5G 1827–1829, p. 500; *Ibid.*, vol. 5K 1829–1832, p. 392; *Ibid.*, vol. 50 1832–1836, p. 497; *Ibid.*, vol. 5T 1836–1839, pp. 33, 100, 498, 541; *Ibid.*, vol. 5W 1839–1843, pp. 131, 353, 357, 468, 526, 533; *Ibid.*, vol.

6A 1843–1846, pp. 206, 211, 368, 552; *Ibid.*, vol. 6B 1846–1849, pp. 62, 220, 505; *Ibid.*, vol. 6D 1853–1857, p. 483; *Charleston Courier*, August 20, 1836; *Ibid.*, September 4, 1841; Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. A 1838–1841 (Charleston County), pp. 487–488; *Ibid.*, vol. E 1846–1852, pp. 93–94; *Ibid.*, vol. F 1852–1853, p. 163; Inventories, Appraisements & Sales vol. A 1839–1844 (Charleston County), p. 511; *Journal of the House of Representatives in South Carolina for 1835*, pp. 43, 79; *Journal of the House of Representatives in South Carolina for 1836*, p. 24; Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1843, number 10.5 (Charleston County); Miscellaneous Records vol. 5H 1823–1830 (Secretary of State), p. 106; *Ibid.*, vol. 5M 1830–1832, p. 229; *Ibid.*, vol. 5Y 1840–1842, p. 331; *Ibid.*, vol. 5Z 1842–1843, pp. 257, 555; Mortgages vol. 3Z 1836–1840 (South Carolina), p. 620; *Ibid.*, vol. 4A 1840–1844, pp. 38, 94, 214, 219, 327; Record of Wills vol. 36 1818–1826 (Charleston County), p. 1123; *Ibid.*, vol. 42 1839–1845, p. 260; *Ibid.*, vol. 43 1839–1845, p. 633; *Ibid.*, vol. 46 1851–1856, pp. 41, 258.

*Listed as a free Negro in the document

Table A-3. Free Black Slaveowners Reported on the Federal Census with Documentation of Slaveownership in Charleston City, South Carolina, 1850.

Slaveowner	Transaction documented
1. William Barnwell*	His slaves, Vensus Huger and her child, sued for their freedom in 1851
2. Edward Lee	Mortgaged Edwin for $1,400 in 1840
3. Jane Wightman	Mortgaged Dick and Liddy for $200 in 1852
4. Peter Brown	Bought a black woman named Vensus for $300 in 1844
5. Ann Duprat	Bought Silvia, a 13: or 14-year-old girl, for $350 in 1824
6. James Johnston	Bought Isabella, a mulatto woman, for $800 in 1840
7. Abraham Jones	Bought Ive or Joseph for $200 in 1834
8. Caroline Lebate	Bought Louisa, a mulatto woman, for $500 in 1849
9. John Lee*	Sold Edwin, a black male, for $600 in 1842
10. Mary Ann McCall	Bought a black girl named Jane for $430 in 1842
11. Henrietta McNeil	Bequeathed her servant Jennette to her grandson in 1855
12. William W. Seymour*	Died in the possession of three slaves valued at $2,400 in 1862
13. Betsey Walker*	Mortgaged a 30-year-old black woman named Margaret for $800 in 1842
14. Ellen Bass	Bought four slaves, formerly owned by her father, for $285
15. Francis Carmand	Sold a 25-year-old mulatto woman named Adeline for $449 in 1849
16. Juliet Cox*	Sold a Negro woman named Beck[y] for $95 in 1851

17. Robert Howard*	Bought William, a 22-year-old black man, for $550 in 1849
18. William Inglis	Bought two brothers named John and James for $420 in 1848
19. Pheobe Lewis	Sold an 18-year-old mulatto girl named Jane for $75 in 1849
20. John Mishaw	Sold Diana, a servant woman, for $190 in 1847
21. Ann Jones Walker	Received wages from slaves hired out during the 1840s
22. Anthony Weston	Bought Betsey and her children, Sam, David and Lucy, for $1,175 in 1844
23. Rebecca Swinton*	Bought Mary, a 50-year-old woman, for $100 in 1854
24. Ann Bentham	Bought Maria, a 13-month-old child, for $5 in 1842
25. Elizabeth Cheves	Servant named Susan was murdered in 1850
26. William Clarke	Mortgaged Louisa and her three children for $2,000 in 1839
27. Amelia L. Cornwell	Bought Savy and her three children for $1,200 in 1858
28. William P. DaCosta	Sold Thomas and William for $1,000 in 1844
29. John L. Francis	Sold Melisha and her four children for $1,030 in 1850
30. Elias W. Garden	Bought Sandy, a black man, for $500 in 1843
31. James Harrison	Bought Mary Ann, a 32-year-old black woman, for $100 in 1854
32. Celeste Hillagas	Bought Dolly and Elizabeth for $600 in 1846
33. Richard Holloway, Jr.	Bought Cato for $100 in 1845
34. Elizabeth Holloway	Received wages from slaves hired out during the 1850s and 1860s
35. Thomas Holmes	Sold Peter, a slave boy, for $200 in 1846
36. James D. Johnson	Sold Judy, a 30-year-old woman, for $300 in 1850
37. Richmond Kinloch	Died in the possession of four slaves valued at $1,000 in 1852
38. Ann Mitchell	Died in the possession of one slave named Isaac in 1860
39. John Francis Plumeau*	Servant Pheobe's child baptized in 1855
40. Joseph Terry	Bought Phoebe, a 37-year-old mulatto, for $100 in 1851
41. Jacob Weston	Bought Henry, a 16-year-old boy, for $700 in 1842
42. Samuel Weston	Bought William, a black man, for $300 in 1849

Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedules I & II, Charleston City, South Carolina; Bills of Sale vol. 5A 1823-1825 (Secretary of State), p. 293; Ibid., vol. 5W 1839-1843, pp. 131, 307, 408, 414, 461; Ibid., vol. 6A 1843-1846, pp. 129, 166, 183, 216, 328, 406; Ibid., vol. 6B 1846-1849, pp. 62, 261, 418, 505, 526, 545; Ibid., vol. 6C 1849-1853, pp. 34, 92; Ibid., vol. 6D 1853-1857, pp. 95, 152, 161, 549, 124; Ibid., vol. 6E 1857-1863, p. 85; Charleston Mercury, January 26, 1850;

Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. D 1847-1849 (Charleston County), pp. 436-437; Ibid., vol. F 1852-1853, p. 116; Ibid., vol. L 1860-1861, pp. 263-264; Ibid., vol. F 1852-1853, pp. 72, 227; Inventories vol. C 1850-1854 (Charleston County), p. 234; Ibid., vol. F 1860-1864, pp. 168, 394; Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1843, Number 10.5 (Charleston County); Miscellaneous Records vol. SQ 1834-1839 (Secretary of State), p. 125; Mortgages vol. 4Z 1839-1840 (South Carolina), p. 620; Ibid., vol. 4E 1848-1853, p. 410; Ibid., vol. 4A 1840-1844, pp. 38, 327; Record of Wills vol. 47 1851-1857 (Charleston County), p. 697; J.S.G. Richardson, Reports of Cases At Law Argued and Determined in the Court of Appeal and Court of Errors of South Carolina vol. 5 (Columbia: A.S. Johnston, 1852), pp. 273-275; Henrietta P. Jervey, ed., "The Private Register of the Rev. Paul Trapier," South Carolina Historical Magazine vol. 58 (1957), p. 170.

Appendix B

Table for Chapter Two

Table B-I. Names of Free Black Slaveholding Heads of Families and Number of Slaves Held, South Carolina, 1790–1860.

*Listed as white
**Absentee slaveowner
***Listed as head of two separate households
****Source: Tax list of Charleston City for 1860

Name	Slaves
1790	
Beaufort District	
Joseph Loyd	6
William Gordon	1
Charleston District	
St. Bartholomew's Parish	
Mrs. Annson	2
Patrick	3
James Miles	13
John Cotron	2
St. George Parish	
Joseph Pendarvis*	4
Thomas Pendarvis*	2
St. James Goose Creek Parish	
Binah (free woman)	2
St. John's Parish	
Joche	1
Daniel Eady	1
Ned Tanner	3
Quach	1
St. Paul's Parish	
James Pendarvis*	123
Estate of William Pendarvis*	44
St. Phillip's & St. Michael's Parish	
Freeman (free)	1
Martin & Robin (free)	3
Abigail (free)	1
Robin (free)	1
Marian (free)	2
Joe (free)	2
• • • (free moors)	1
George Gardner (free)	9
Lander (free?)	2
Peter Mathews (free)	1
Nelly Miller (free)	1
Jenny May (free)	1
Lambold (free)	1
Moor (free)	3
Mrs. Daniels (free)	1
Johnson (free)	1
Finton (free)	1
Joseph (free)	3
Mary (free)	2
Cate (free moor)	4
Ruth Cole (free)	3

Name	Slaves
Jenny (free)	3
Grace (free)	1
Dick Mazyck (free)	2
Patty (free)	1
Betty & Lucy (free)	1
Bess (free)	I
Mathews (free)	3
Lydia Watson (free)	5
Abigail (free)	4
Sarah Lampton (free)	1
Bett Weaver (free)	1
Clarissa (free)	2
Mitchell (free)	4
Sam Walden (free)	I
Sarah Fash (free)	2
Lancaster District	
Arthur Collier	2
Orangeburgh District	
Shadrick Read*	3
James Newness	5
George Galphin*	15
Rachael Galphin*	5
Joseph Pendarvis*	41
William Pendarvis*	1
John Pendarvis	1

1800

Barnwell District	
Shadrick Read	1
Beaufort District	
St. Peter's Parish	
Ann Hill	1
Richard Jones	1
Charleston District	
Christ Church Parish	
Nelly Collins	2
St. George Parish	
Joseph Pendarvis*	3
St. John's Parish	
Daniel Eady	2
Edward Tanner	7
St. Paul's Parish	
Estate of James Pendarvis	156
Estate of William Pendarvis	50
St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish	
Carter Akins	I
St. Phillip's & St. Michael's Parish	
Free Negroes	2
Free Negroes	8
Free Negroes	3
Free Negroes	3
Free Negroes	2
Lucretia Clark	3
Free Negroes	6
Free Negroes	1
Free Negroes	2
Free Negroes	15
Free Negroes	1
Free Negroes	5
Free Negroes	1
Free Negroes	2
Josephine Olman	3
Free Negroes	2
Free Negroes	5
Free Negroes	4
Free Negroes	6
Free Negroes	1
Free Negroes	2
Free Negroes	1
Free Negroes	4
Free Negroes	4
Free Negroes	3
Free Negroes	1
Free Negroes	1
Free Negroes	2
Free Negroes	1
Georgetown District	
John William	7
Elias Collins	68
Marion District	
Samson Shoemaker	1
Harman Shoecraft	7

Name	Slaves
Orangeburgh District	
John Pendarvis	I
Sumter District	
Jimmy (free Negro)	12

1810

Name	Slaves
Beaufort District	
Alexander Brown*	4
Charleston DIstrict	
Colleton County	
Joseph Pendarvis*	6
Josiah Pendarvis*	3
Frank Logan	9
James Harrison	1
Daniel Benton	5
Luke and Patrick	I
William Orce	4
St. Andrew's Parish	
Mrs. Bisck	8
St. John's Berkeley Parish	
Jonathan Eady	3
Daniel Eady	5
St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish	
James Anderson	71
Jonathan Collins	2
Robert Collins	10
Esther McIntoish	5
Samuel Cochran	4
Estate of Michael Fowler*	5
Charlotte Boone	1
Edgefield District	
Nathan Rinnely	3
David Calvin	I
Charles Holly	3
Georgetown District	
John Gardner	40
Alexander Snow	3
Elias Collins	16
Marcus [Great]	2
John William, Sr.	8
Sampson Holmes	11
George Garvin	2
Kershaw District	
Elijah Bass	2
Marion District	
Harmon Shoecraft	12
Jesse Scott	11
Sumter District	
Isham Scott	5

1820

Name	Slaves
Barnwell District	
Barney McKinnie	7
Beaufort District	
St. Helene Parish	
Alexander Brown	11
Jack Loyd	2
St. Peter's Parish	
Elender Hill	5
Prince William's Parish	
Peter Jackson	1
Charleston District	
St. Bartholomew's Parish	
J. Johnston	3
St. George Parish	
John Croker	1
Ann Lynes	I
Lamb [Stevens]	2
Sam Perry	6
Mary Dunfries	1
Kesiah Stevenson	I
St. John's Parish	
Paul Johnson	2
St. Paul's Parish	
Frank Logan	14
Rich[ard] Wilkinson	2
John Garden	26

Name	Slaves
St. James & Goose Creek Parish	
Sally Brown	3
Eli Cockles	5
Susan Roach	4
St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish	
John William	17
Isaac Harleston	6
Esther Anderson	11
Charlotte Boone	8
Robert Collins	10
Jacob Fowler	5
Stanhope Fowler	1
St. Stephen's Parish	
Jonathan Eady**	4
Charleston City	
Maria Gotton	4
Diana Alston	2
William Pencile [Penceel]	2
Thomas Ingals	15
John Perroneau	6
William Cooper	4
Nancy McDowal	1
Tobey Ogilou	13
Susan Tobias	1
John Francis	2
Harriot Nelson	6
Caby Jones	7
Christiana Gowan	1
Francis Laford	8
Eliza Bailey	2
Rosey Sommers	6
Hannah McKenzie	2
Samuel Walker	12
S. Bryan	13
Nancy Tuano	3
Grace Wilkenson	1
Hagar Turpin	2
Katey Jones	2
Sally Jones	3
Audet Phillipe	5
Francis Perre	6
[William] Brown Stevens	1
Ann Randall	4
Sally Seymour	4
Smart Stoll	2
Beck Carley	10
Mrs. McNeal	8
Rebecca Dwight	1
Moses Irvine	3
Jehu Jones, Jr.	6
Hagar Legare	2
Maria Buckle	3
Sarah West	3
Amelia Dallus	2
M. Mathews	4
Hannah Danham	4
Kitty Barella	1
D. Hampton	3
Hannah Thompson	1
Silva Manuel	2
Betsey McIntosh	8
York Stewart	3
Jean Battute	2
Aberdeen	2
Abbe Anderson	8
Rosette Tunno	2
Catherine Roberts	3
Sophia Jones	1
E. Theus	3
Philisen Pratt	1
Amelia Savage	2
James Mitchell	12
Mary Peace	2
Peter Parlour	2
Silva Aiken	1
Richard Holloway	6
Rachel Wells	5
Mary Francis	5
Fanny Graham	1
Tissey Ramonsan	1
George Charnock	2
Henry Micheal	4
Lucy Deas	5
John Martin	3
Sarah Linsay	1
F[abius] Singleton	5
Mrs. Moucriesse	1
G.W. Edwards	2
Nancy Boudo	4
Dinah Gaillard	2
Clara McGinnis	4
Nancy Gadsden	4
Maria Legg	2
Ann May	8
Richard Moore	18
Sarah Johnson	2
Darcus Sasah	1
George Johnson	5

Name	Slaves
Clarissa Simons	5
Kitty Perreneau	4
Bella Creighton	13
Jacob Moore	7
Alice Berry	4
Ann Netral	4
Mary Frances	4
Mary Goff	2
Harriot Desussure	1
Jane Cantun	9
Philip Coste	1
Andrel DeLarge	2
Dinah Francis	I
Sarah Cochran	I
Mrs. Campbell	11
James Haig	3
Celestian Delcour	16
Mary Cock	2
John Lee	I
Mary Schion	2
Mary Smith	3
Lydia Snow	10
Nancy Brown	1
[Barbary] Maria Bampfield	2
Mary Creighton	3
Hannah McKensay	5
Charleston Neck	
Dinah Geddes	7
E. Bishop	I
Cato Dawson	4
Robert Smith	6
M. Allean	3
R. Gregorie	4
Ame Johnson	8
Sarah Edward	4
C. Alder	2
R. Godfred	3
Hector Thompson	4
Hannah Keith	9
Elsey Dupre	1
Mary St. John	2
Aberdeen Forrest	4
Cara Ashe	I
Margaret Shaw	22
Hannah Clarey	4
Grace Smith	3
Charles Corr	3
P. Gunter	6
Cloe Gadson	10
Peter Alwick	6
John Francis	9
Rachael Forrest	18
Hester Abrahams	3
Peter Rinay	3
Rose Fenwicke	9
Martha Evans	7
Hannah O'Hara	8
James Brown	2
Patsey Monroe	10
H. Hatchinson	7
Sabina Gadsden	9
Pharo Moses	2
Samuel Cochran	5
Mary Florin	4
Molly Mathews	19
E. Smyth	5
Betty Newton	11
Samuel Bennett	4
David Garnnerette	5
B. Mackey	2
Nancy Dereef	I
C. DeVillers	4
Adam Lewis	3
Mary Righton	8
Dinah Culler	5
B[ecky] Jackson	8
Samuel Cochran	10
Carolina Taylor	12
Nancy Bell	2
Dennis Hooper	14
Ann Johnston	2
Adam Blackwood	7
Castel Sullivan	4
Seuder Smith	7
John Mitchell	I
Ann Snow	2
H.V. Lecompte	17
Adam Brown	I
Peter Middleton	1
Ishamael Crawford	3
Joseph Martin	1
Edward Bertrand	8
Mary Mundary	4
Maria Williamson	3
Jenny Turpin	I
Jane Brown	10
Sarah Brown	10
Mark Bonneau	13
James Savage	1

Name	Slaves
Mary Savage	8
Pleasant Fair	5
John Garden*	9
Chesterfield District	
Zachariah Carity	I
Georgetown District	
LaIotte Ferrett	3
George Mitchell	2
George Garvins	6
Nancy Greggs	6
Marcus Great	5
George Pawley	I
Alexander Snow	7
Sampson Holmes	13
Alexander Holmes	I
Elias Collins	32
Kershaw District	
Elijah Bass	2
Bonds Conway	I
Lauren District	
Cain (free)	3
Pendleton District	
David Burdine	1
Sumter District	
William Ellison	2
David Scott	2
Geo. Joy	2
Adam Joy	2

1830

Abbeville District	
Ezekiel Davis	I
Jerry Payne	2
Beaufort District	
St. Helena Parish	
Alexander Brown	15
Ann Houston	1
St. Luke's Parish	
Gordon Bing	I
Sarah Cuthbert	3
St. Peter's Parish	
Mack Powers	1
Ann & Elender Hill*	II
Charleston District	
St. John's Berkeley Parish	
Daniel Eady	7
St. Stephen's Parish	
Hestor Blute	1
Samuel Davis	1
Jacob Freeman	4
Jenny Wilson	16
Jonathan Eady	5
St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish	
Robert Collins	II
Jonathan Collins	3
William Collins	I
Susan Cumbo	6
Stanhope Fowler	5
Abraham Givins	1
Robert Smith	8
Juba Warren	8
Thomas Bonneau**	3
St. James Santee Parish	
Thomas Aiken	7
Charleston City	
Ward I	
Emmey Parsons	2
Christiana Veree	I
Henry James	3
John Cains	6
Amey Spencer	1
Scipio Wilkinson	2
Rebecca Duncan	3
Sarah Leach	7
Eleanor Fell	3
Samuel Walker	24
Fortune Ward	8
Amarette Best	12
Susan Holman	1
Sarah Hugar	1
Sally Richards	1
Ebenezer Vanderhorst	1
Pollidore Morrison	14
Moses Brown	2
Jane Mitchell	15

Name	Slaves
Edward Lee	2
Abigail Mitchell	I
Eleanor Inglis	1
Jack Gardner	4
George Wilson	3
Francois Prereze	6
Mary ROgers	I
Jane Monies	I
Ward 2	
Thomas Inglis	11
Margaret Douglass	7
Eleanor Cotton	12
Adam Bush	7
William Chisolm	I
Rosetta Summers	3
Daphne Elliott	2
Sarah Holmes	12
Peter Brown	3
Silvey Savage	4
Dina Lloyd	6
Francois Sorie	I
John Brown	3
Ann May	3
William Cooper	2
Mary Keeter	6
Mindas Graves	5
Effey Townsend	1
Sally Middleton	16
Diana Flagg	8
Rose Whaley	I
William Mushington	I
Maria Williamson	1
Hetty Hannahan	4
Benjamin T. Huger	8
Hannah Duprat	2
George Mathews	13
Lydia Watson	3
James Gordon	2
Moses Irvine	4
Casar Wright	14
John Lee	22
Gilbert Wale	2
Eliza Dwight	3
Camilla Johnston	16
Eleanor Smith	I
Rose Dubois	2
Mary Carado	I
Peggy Nelson	I
Thomas J. Cooper	2
John McBeath	3
Martha Pennington	3
William W. Seymour	1
Ward 3	
Edward Bateman	12
Kitty Desiesseline	9
Sarah Cliss	1
Linda Smith	5
Jane Brown	8
Samuel Campbell	1
Joseph Lecombe	5
Hestor French	2
Sylvia Ball	1
Ellen Jackson	3
Maria Buckle	2
Grace Creighton	8
Mary Ann Roteraux	I
Mary Fenwick	11
Jack Harper	3
Sarah Ferguson	8
Emele Pere	8
Sally Mills	5
Dolly Wilson	5
Martha Allen	12
Elizabeth Martin	8
Frank Crawley	13
Betsy White	1
Eliza Lindsay	2
Charlotte Evans	3
Rebecca Bremar	3
Cecelia Cooper	3
Affey Simmons	6
Eliza Cochran	I
Smart Simpson	8
Flora Brisbane	I
Lydia Burnie	41
Mary St. Salarey	2
Elizabeth Holton	8
Rachel Jackson	I
Mary Gardner	I
Barbara Barquet	9
Darcus Brown	1
Josephine Cookson	2
Rachel Gibson	2
Philette Belanto	2
Maria Creighton	1
Lydia Weston	I
Patty Jenkins	I
Jane Drayton	17

Name	Slaves
Peggy Whitehart	10
Elizabeth Hinson	15
Mary Hinson	1
Naselye Lafayette	5
Ann Florin	1
Ellen LaPorte	1
Sarah Turner	1
Catherine Johnston	2
Henrietta Lockwood	1
Mary Desage	2
Phillis Duncan	4
Mary Richards	2
Emma Loyd	4
Mary Smith	2
Rachel Wells	3
Betsey Newton	5
Malcolm Brown	5
Polly Lewis	1
Harriot Jenkins	1
Rosetta Fuller	5
Jenny Careu	1
James Eason	3
Affey Levy	6
Sophia Johnson	9
Patience McKenzie	1
Molly Brown	7
Emele L. Cornwell	3
Dolly Legare	14
Adel Bourneau	2
E. Trenne	2
Adam Gregorie	6
Charles Lemar	5
William Simmons	2
Louisa Armon	3
Mary Bemar	5
Mary Watts	10
Michel Singleton	1
Carlos Smith	4
Susan Wilson	1
Julia Cox	3
Rose Ward	5
John B. Mathews	6
Lydia Stevenson	1
Bella Aiken	4
Sandy Magwood	12
Mary Simmons	1
Peter Mathews	1
Catherine Jacobs	8
Rebecca Thorne	3

Name	Slaves
Ward 4	
Barbara Barquet***	9
Sylvia Miller	1
Antonet Langlois	1
John Francis	5
James D. Johnston	6
Betsey Walker	1
Rachel Boyce	6
Elsey Lee	2
Julietta Canter	14
Samuel Weston	1
Joseph Humphreys	3
Betsey Lesessue	4
Mary Mathews	8
Cater Roberts	2
Nancy Manuel	3
Ann Brown	4
Hagar Cole	2
Eliza McCall	2
Sophia Ives	1
F. Lesessene	1
Angeline Smith	12
Maria Holmes	5
Joseph Barrelle	1
Eliza Pinckney	7
Susan Drayton	2
Nancy Wilson	1
Ann Mitchell	10
Thomas Small	3
F. Ross	7
Crecia King	3
Mary Freeman	3
Simon Groning	9
Tenah Townsend	2
Cyrus Smith	2
Martha Garden	2
Priscilla North	3
Maria Lord	1
Martha Taylor	3
John Harrison	4
Hagar Cole***	1
Jehu Jones, Jr.	1
Ann Mitchell	6
Henrietta Savage	1
Richard Holloway	8
Charlotte Blanchard	1
James Harrison	1
Hetty Hannahan***	2
Henry Liston	2
Samuel McCall	10

Name	Slaves	Name	Slaves
James Maxwell	2	**Charleston Neck**	
Elizabeth Veree	2	Susan Vesey	10
Zanza White	7	Betty Robinson	10
Vensus Roberts	2	Mary Righton	12
John Smith	3	Sophia Johnston	6
Benjamin Jones	1	Mary Deas	12
Sarah Johnston	1	Polly Brown	10
Clarissa Simons	6	Daffney Connor	I
Benjamin Lawrence	8	Betty Inglesby	11
Grace Lee	3	Natt Ball	7
Katey Peronneau	6	Antony Dill	13
Stephen River	5	John Jervey	14
Mary Barron	1	James Bell	11
Mary Holton	4	Martha Jackson	11
Henry B. Mathews	4	Hagar Johnston	11
Harriot Desoures	I	Eliza Franklin	10
Julia Eggart	2	Baron Stiemetz	I
Sarah Shaw	6	Jacob Mott	1
Rose Cameron	4	James R. Clarke	12
Jane Esuard	2	Mary Wilson	5
John Lewis	2	Betsey McIntosh	10
Sally Beale	7	Ann William	11
James Cummings	1	Nancy Delancy	2
Mary Ann Berry	5	Amos Baxter	1
Ann Philips	1	Castille Sullivan	6
Mary White	I	Hannah Solomon	20
Portis Badger	I	Jane Turpin	1
William Legg	3	Catherine Sasportas	5
Philide Turner	5	Rachel Glen	12
Emma James	6	Hannah Parson	6
Priscilla Deversey	7	Martha Gilchrist	11
Jane Downs	4	Samuel Cochran	6
Catherine Bridgewood	1	Jeremiah Jones	10
Thomas Cochran	11	Henry Mathews	6
Bella Dart	2	Cato McCleod	2
Catherine Anderson	12	Jane Mathews	14
Richmond Kinloch	2	Charles Bercier	10
John Francis	3	Eliza Bolard	5
George Lawrence	9	Maria Liles	5
C.E. Bursier	7	Catherine Gilberry	4
Mary Yeadon	11	William McKinney	4
Samuel Tucker	6	Simon Smith	5
Sarah Shaw***	10	Mary Ann North	6
Isabella Izard	1	Assent Michel	4
Abraham Ashe	4	Sylvia Wilson	10
Margaret Shaw	3	Ann Belmore	10
Roxana Moultrie	1	Mary Ann Pope	10
C. Young	1	Mary Payne	10
Susan Cypress	5	Peggy Cripps	10
Fanny Boyd**	4	Amelia Simons	3
Fanny Graham**	5		

Name	Slaves
Flora Filbin	11
Lucy Wilkinson	3
Diana Creighton	11
Henry Keith	7
Mary Busby	10
Mary Pogson	9
Isaac Burkmeyer	3
Cato Holmes	6
Jane Talley	11
Mary Furman	1
James Service	2
Jacob Edward	10
Sarah Dewees	1
John Weston	1
Richard Dereef	5
James Brown	5
Hector Drayton	5
Susan Ann Dereef	5
John Jamiesson	2
Phoebe Cross	11
Joe Pohl	12
Henry Edwards	3
Elizabeth Lee	12
Nancy Harleston	4
Hagar Holmes	5
Nelly Mickey	1
James Edwards	10
Susan Camer	4
Isaac Bateman	5
Mary Gregory	6
Mary C. Pillotte	14
Margaret Kelly	8
Antonet Langlois	2
Eleanor Gregory	2
Juliet Plumet	3
Crissy Mitchell	4
Thomas Gowan	10
Margaret Crummell	1
Belser Antonie	4
Susan Legare	10
Charles Henry	2
Diana Mayrant	8
Thomas Strobel	13
Ann Wilson	13
Peter Wall	13
Mary McCready	12
Pleasant Fair	7
Richard Moore	3
Mary Brown	6
Cuffey Jones	8
George Bishop	4
Nancy Tucker	11
Cuffey Alston	13
Will Pryor	11
Betty Rosenberg	12
Reuben Small	11
Benjamin Dallas	13
Paul Cleveland	8
William Guest	7
D. Watson	7
James Sayward	6
Peter Parlar	10
Hagar Parker	9
Elizabeth Lee	3
Ann Mitchell	2
Mary Wigfall	3
Louisa Deport	2
John Mishaw	8
Joseph Lamford	3
William Tardiff	4
Mary L. Johnston	4
Mary Shilon	3
Peter Marchant	1
William Friday	2
Louisa Johnson	3
Frank Capers	2
Thomas Lyon	3
John Garden	10
Albert Smith	1
A.W. Foster	14
Samuel Maverick	6
Nelly Oliver	4
Chesterfield District	
Michell Shade	8
Jno. Revells	4
Colleton District	
St. James Goose Creek Parish	
S. Brown	2
Richard Russell	2
Henry Holmes	12
John Bell	12
St. Paul's Parish	
Jane Logan	16
Daniel Postell	11
John Garden*	52

Name	Slaves
St. George Parish	
Lamb Stevens	7
Edgefield District	
Marey Moore	3
Kershaw District	
George Harris	1
Chestnut Richard	2
Ceiley Spikes	I
David Scott	4
Theresa Taylor	I
Newberry District	
Charles Brown	4
Nancy Felker	I
Moses Heller	2
Jesse Glouster	4
Jane Thompson	2
Lucy Dennis	3
Hannah Bugg	I
Martha Leonard	I
Orangeburgh District	
John Barrs	2
Richland District	
Jim Patterson	3
Susan Bostick	4
Sally Moore	2
Peter Green	4
Rebecca Mote	1
Mary Jackson	2
Mary Shavers	I
Sumter District	
William Ellison	4
Williamsburgh District	
Hesekiah Cockfield	2
York District	
Cassy Michum	I

1840

Name	Slaves
Abbeville District	
J.S. Wilson	4
S. Chatman	1
W. Ronse	I
H. Wilson	I
J.N. Allen	4
Hanes Greer	3
D. Donaldson	6
Anderson District	
Anthony Coats	I
Barnwell District	
Phillip Cohen	2
William Curtis	I
Henry Floyd	3
Elias Beard	1
Lewis Kinsey•	2
Charleston District	
St. James & Goose Creek Parish	
E. Smart (free Negro)	I
Isaac Conn[ors] (free Negro)	10
Lamb Stevens (free Negro)	14
St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish	
Robert Collins	10
Charlotte Collins	3
Robert Collins, Jr.	4
Jonathan Collins	9
Stanhope Fowler	2
Jacob Boag	9
Charleston City	
Ward I	
Mary James	5
Sarah Blanc	3
Elsey Haig	5
Ibe Dewees	5
Cynthia Mathews	I
Elizabeth Cotton	3
E. Vanderherst	4
Cyrus B. Smith	3
Peter Brown	2
Philis Johnson	19
Toby Waring	13
Judy Kennedy	5
Jane Campbell	4
Elizabeth Hinsen	6
Barbara Barquet	8
John Cain	2
Avery Lowndes	2
Sarah Barnwell	3

Name	Slaves
Juliana Izard	1
Edward Lee	2
Mary Taylor	5
Jane Wightman	7
Sylvia Wiggins	2
Sarah Turner	1
Sarah Wilson	1
Susan Drummond**	3
Ward 2	
Mary Moultrie	4
James Johnston	10
Stephen McLane	18
Rachel Simonds	2
William W. Seymour	18
Cornelia Newton	1
Ellen Inglis	I
Mary Ogilvie	6
George Watkins	13
Hannah Humphrey	I2
Nancy Payton	2
John Hulland	1
Rosey Summers	6
Elizabeth Wright	15
Betsey Walker	6
Sarah Dawson	15
Elizabeth Mushington	7
Ann Haskell	2
Ann Deas	7
Isaac Mathews	14
M. Duncan	18
Eliza Francis	11
Syetta Smith	9
Susan Payne	7
Ellen Dickson	5
Peggy Naylor	10
William Cooper	3
Caroline Dwight	6
Mary Green	I
Harriot Nelt	13
Sylvia Savage	1
Sophia Minot	6
Peter Brown	5
Emma McCall	3
Susan Williamson	4
Catherine Barnwell	4
Diana Fregenane	1
Mose Irvine	7
Joseph Williams	2
Thomas Izard	12
Emineline Jones	3
Sam Mathews	4
Ann Hanscome	16
Martha S. Inglis	12
Ann Duprat	7
Mary Hollinsbury	9
Indiana McLean	6
Ward 3	
Jeanette Inglis	5
Mary DeLarge	10
Julia Cox	6
Isaac McNellage	6
John B. Mathews	3
Mary Freeman	1
Beck Snow	1
Bella Aiken	1
Margaret Crummell	4
Peter Nelson	14
Louisa Hammond	2
Eliza Walker	2
Ann Walker	7
Lavina Legre	5
John Drayton	1
Patience McKinsey	5
Sarah St. Mark	1
Catherine Stevens	3
Hannah McBeth	2
Mary Emery	11
Maria Corr	10
Mary Rosaline	6
Harriot Howard	3
Mary Simmons	2
Diana Dorrell	25
Mary Boorcas	7
Sylvia Parker	2
John Thompson	4
Phille Belando	3
Phillis White	5
Thomas Walden	7
Eliza Lining	7
ELiza Stewart	5
Mary Mayrant	1
Phoebe Lewis	9
Emma Jones	10
A. Quash	1
Robert Maryck	2
Margaret Holton	9
Mary Adeline Mitchell	1
Emeline Bentham	4

Name	Slaves
Mary Landean	6
John St. Mark	2
Fanny Williams	I
Emanuel Penceel**	3
Jack Harper**	6
Sarah Jenkins	7
Ward 4	
W.P. DaCosta	5
Sarah Weston	1
Samuel Weston	14
Priscilla North	7
Mary Williamson	12
Charlotte Nelson	I
Mary Moulthree	1
Rose Prioleau	5
Charlotte Taylor	3
William McKinley	1
Sarah McIntosh	1
Louisa Richardson	2
Henry Francis	I
Susan Marshall	1
James Maxwell	5
Mary Grippon	1
Sarah Fritzsimons	1
Edward White	1
Tinah Griffin	1
Fabius Singleston	1
John Smith	2
Harriot Harrison	1
Richard Holloway	3
Elizabeth Motte	2
J. Harrison	2
Jane Wilson	3
Ann May	2
Esther L. Lewis	1
Margaret Ford	1
Fanny Graham	3
Rachel Drayton	5
Sarah Turner	I
Betty Turner	2
Turner Parson	2
Betsey Newton	4
Adel Myers	2
Nancy Warn	1
Caroline Lubet	I
Ann Mitchell	7
Bella Dart	1
Joseph P. Humphrey	4
Terisa Carvan	7
Mary Ann Mitchell	2
Richard Holloway	I
Mary Subt	1
Susan Wilson	I
Catherine Anderson	6
Titus Daisey	3
Pompey Macbeth	8
Mary Mushington	12
Hetty Hannahan	I
William McKinlay	15
John Francis	12
J.D. Johnson	6
John J. Parker	3
John Lewis	2
Elizabeth Barnwell	3
Ann Wilson	1
William Beeman	17
Ann Wilson***	I
Rachel Gallashaw	3
Mary Smith	2
Jacob Weston	2
Elizabeth Taylor	4
Phileda Turner	4
Sally Johnson	3
Clarissa Simons	9
Grace Smith	4
Catherine Lopez	1
Catherine Perroneau	6
Titus Gregory	6
W.B. Clarke	6
Rollin Bascombe	4
Thomas Gray	9
Elizabeth Phillips	8
Rose Simons	5
Mary J. Barro	5
Emma Johnson	5
Ann Mitchell	5
Caroline Veree	1
Elizabeth Smith	12
Hestor Annaten	2
Phillis Gunther	8
Thomas Cole	1
Martha Quash	6
Castel Sullivan	14
Martha Smith	4
Nelly Rose	14
Jane Smith	2
Margaret Catheral	2
John Oliver	I
Richmond Kinloch	5
Diana Wright	6

Name	Slaves	Name	Slaves
Emeline Lafrange	3	Sarah Hawinette	7
Mary White	1	Jane Deas	7
Eliza Beeman	4	Fanny Boyd	9
Mary Ann Smith	3	Lydia Bull	11
		Catherine Hopkins	6
Charleston Neck		Dolly McNeal	12
Anthony Weston	8	Joseph Motte	3
Martha McKinlay	1	Richard E. Dereef	7
Isaac Bateman	I	Sarah Burk	2
William Burdo	8	Charlotte Ball	5
Daniel Cox	3	Henry Mathews	4
Sylvia Keith	II	Catherine Well	2
Ellen Burkmeyer	I	Hannah Turnbull	2
Robert Simons	2	Lucy Morris	4
Amos Baxter	2	Susan Nelson	1
Elias Garden	1	Susan Hext	1
Robert Wigfall	1	Eleanor Emanuel	12
Mary Fayman	1	John Castion	I
Abraham Rutledge	2	Mary Ann Lazar	1
Lydia Weston	I	Ann Murray	1
Joseph Martin	1	James Grant	3
Fancey Keith	9	Richard Gregory	6
Eleanor Cotton	I	Peter Mathews	2
Abraham Simons	7	Charles Carter	4
Ann Snow	5	Nelson Richardson	3
Isabella Pierce	7	Edward Labatut	2
Mary Mitchell	6	Mary Savage	2
Jacob Izard	2	Joseph Ready	15
Jane Allen	1	Abraham Scott	2
Smart Owens	8	Susan Saunders	8
Daphney Moulhie	8	Joseph Dereef	10
Rosana Nyles	10	Stephen Shrewsberry	8
Joe Duncan	8	John L. Lewis	2
Francis Simons	1	Grace Cumming	1
Titus Gregory	1	Sarah Weston	2
Jacob Dickinson	I	Sam Porter	3
Hestor Barron	2	Joshua Wilson	I
Eliza Deas	4	John Snow	I
Cheney Mease	10	Edward Baxter	17
Jacob Motte	9	James Brown	6
Eliza Franklin	I	J.M. Prevost	2
Hagar Johnson	7	John DeLarge	1
Ben Read	6	Henry Jackson	3
Robert Deas	1	Mary Crosby	2
Francis Devenier	3	Hannah Blake	14
Maria E. Wilson	5	Hannah Cockran	9
Ralph Cohrs	2	Peter Devenier	6
William Chisolm	1	Sarah Jacobs	12
Jubah Warren	14	Grace Williams	3
John Bay	6	Eliza Weston	1

Name	Slaves
Sarah Givens	11
Phillies Johnson	16
Maria Reed	1
George Mason	1
John Pinckney	1
John Wilson	1
Rachel Gibson	1
C.W. Ladson	1
Margaret Ferguson	1
Margaret Kelly	6
William Glover	2
Patty Artman	8
Mary Salter	2
Mary Kugely	3
James Cain	8
Harriet Kershaw	2
William Rollin	1
William Hazzard	8
John Judah	2
Moses Drummond	3
John Mishaw	14
Stephen Cockran	5
Septinia Johnson	2
Ready Dawson	6
Samuel Cockran	4
John Ramsay	5
Charlotte Williams	1
Thomas Cooper	6
Edward Logan	2
Rose Creighton	4
Rose Ellwick	8
Chloe Alston	8
Joe Scott	6
Caroline Rivers	3
Peter Gaillard	1
Julia Webb	2
Nancy Susie	5
Richard Owens	4
Jane McCalla	5
William Johnston	2
Malcolm Brown	7
M.C. Moore	7
Ann Forrest	7
Harriot Mishaw	3
Betty Northrop	13
William Lewis	1
Pleasant Freer	6
Taney Caleb	10
Nancy Astley	11
Smart Michael	7
Sarah Young	17
Richard Hart	9
Richard Lawrence	5
Charlotte Grant	6
Jane Mills	10
Rose Pendell	1
Luno Eager	1
Louisa Johnson	2
Sarah Burdell	2
Thomas Chism	2
Paris Cooper	4
Peter H. Merchant	2
William Friday	2
Sarah Gibson	1
John Collins	3
Francis Wilkinson	1
Robert Houston	1
Thomas Cockran	3
William Stoll	5
Franklin Greenland	12
Elizabeth Smith	6
John Garden	9
Mary Hampton	7
Peggy Nelson	11
Count Surzell	9
Augustus Chism	1
Hannah Wilcome	1
Becky Robinson	7
Hannah Lowan	6
Richard Wilkinson	8
Sarah Fowler	1
Louisa McVicar	6
Chesterfield District	
David Winn	1
Colleton District	
St. Paul's Parish	
Jane Logan	20
Daniel Postell	9
William W. Seymour	5
John Garden**	53
Georgetown District	
Alex[ander] Holmes	7
Hagar Bukmon	4
Anna Alston	2
Nancy Banket	8
Dianah Stewad	5
Sarah Lewis	1

Name	Slaves
Richard Nights	5
Elias Collins	40
R.M. Collins	8
March Myers	2
A.J. Anderson	9
Peter Trail	1
D.J. Wilson	2
Lancaster District	
Elijah Wright	8
Lauren District	
Alex Kelley	6
Orangeburgh District	
Ann Tann	8
Priscilla Holly	1
George Scott	1
Jacob Scott	5
John Barrs	7
Newberry District	
Bull Sanders	1
Simon Stockman	4
Richland District	
Ben Dleon	3
John Harrison	3
Phillis Harris	3
Lucy Harris	1
Mary Johnson	3
Robert Holmes	8
Mary Marsh	12
James Patterson	7
David Groom	1
Alexander Wilson	19
Life Witmore	13
Sumter District	
William Ellison	30

1850

Name	Slaves
Anderson District	
Anthony Coats	1
Barnwell District	
John H. Berry*	9
Zed Chavious	2
Philip Cohen*	5
Lewis Kinsey*	8
Charleston District	
St. James Santee Parish	
Thomas Aikens	1
Elias Cumbo	4
St. James Goose Creek Parish	
John Conner	5
Lamb Stevens	30
St. Stephen's Parish	
Jonathan Eady	6
Henry Glencamp	7
Isaac Glencamp	5
Thomas Jefferson	5
Nancy Lewis	2
Daniel Peagler	17
James Peagler	14
St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish	
Jacob & Sarah Boag	9
Janet Collins [John Myers]*	7
Martha Collins	5
Charlotte Collins	6
Andrew James Anderson	12
Stanhope Fowler	3
Charleston City	
Ward 1	
William Barnwell	4
John Cripps	1
Stephen Dickerson	6
Diana Drayton	11
Annette Elliott	2
Jerry Ferguson	7
Toney Greason	5
Jacob & Mary Green**	2
Elizabeth Hinson	8
Sarah Holland	6
Rose Holmes	4
Love Lawrence	8
Edward Lee	4
John Lewis	3
Philis Stint	1
Anna Stint	5
Emily Shaw	14
Rachel Tunno	6
Paul Wigfall	11
Jane Wightman	21

Name	Slaves	Name	Slaves
Christiana Cleveland	5	Juiet Cox	8
Maria Mayrant	5	Adelle Delettre	3
		Francis Deviner	2
Ward 2		Hannah Francis	2
Peter Brown	1	Margaret Fancy	1
Sophia Calhoun	5	Margaret Fielder	1
Robert Cattel	9	Mary Gardner	4
Flora Commersal	5	Ellen Good	1
Mary Cowan	1	Robert Howard	7
Ann Deas	8	Mary Hutchinson	2
Ann Duprat	6	William Inglis	2
Hannah Fields	I	Rebecca Lawson	5
Sarah Hicks	4	Phoebe Lewis	6
William Holmes	2	Mary Maxwell	4
Diana Jenkins	4	Isaac Mathews**	5
Margaret Jenkins	I	Diana McClane	3
James Johnston	6	Jane McGee	5
Abraham Jones	4	Joseph McGilvray	5
Patty Lockwood	8	John Mishaw	5
Carolina Labate	3	Margaret Mitchell	4
John Lee	17	Robert Moultrie	2
Jacob Legare	7	Hamlet Murley	5
Henry Mathews	5	Gersham Myers	1
Mary Ann McCall	1	Peter Nelson	4
Stephen McLean	4	Jane Nicholson	7
Henrietta McNeil	3	George Prince	5
Lucretia Miles	3	Sarah Prioleau	1
Harriot Nelme	10	Augustus Ryan	2
Rebecca Naylor	7	Nancy Simons	5
Charlotte Purvis	3	Susan Swinton	2
Nelly Rout	6	Mary Theus	2
Hannah Rivers	1	John Thorne**	7
Mary Ann Seymour	2	Ann Jones Walker	3
William W. Seymour	2	Toney Weston**	5
Margaret Smith	14	Charlotte Williams	4
Martha Vanderhorst	7		
Betsey Walker	7	*Ward 4*	
Felicity White	1	Catherine Alston	1
		Susan Armstrong	1
Ward 3		Adel Azele	7
Grace Alston	I	Mary Bee	1
Cyrus Barnwell	1	Ann Bentham	1
Ellen Bass	2	Mary J. Barreau	3
Charles Becaise	2	Ann Brown	6
Pauline Beckman	2	Prince Brown	1
James Burke	1	Peter Burget	2
Jane Campbell	3	Ellen Burie	3
Francis Carmand	4	Frederick Campbell	3
William Chisolm	5	Elizabeth Cheves	3
Susan Cooper	1	William Clarke*	2

Name	Slaves
Martha Cleveland	1
Amelia Cornwell	2
William P. DaCosta	10
Isabella Daveaux	1
William Davis	4
John Faber	1
John L. Francis	3
Sarah Fox	7
Mary Ann Fuller	6
Elias William Garden	8
Jane Gray	3
Charlotte Hall	3
James Harrison	2
Celeste Hillagas	3
Richard Holloway	1
Elizabeth Holloway	4
Catherine Holloway	4
Thomas Holmes	4
Mary Holton	2
Nero Horlbeck	3
Benjamin T. Huger	3
Eleanor Jefferson	1
James Drayton Johnson	3
Sarah Johnson	4
Susan Kempton	1
Benjamin Kinloch	3
Richard Kinloch	4
Emmely Lafarge	2
Jane Lewis	5
Mary Legare	4
Catherine Lewis	5
Sarah Lewis	1
Sarah Lincoln	2
Joseph Maxwell	2
Sarah Marshall	4
Mary McBride	2
Thomas McKinley	3
Sarah McNeil	2
Eliza Miller	3
Joshua Mishaw	5
Amelia Mitchell	6
Ann Mitchell	2
Jane Mitchell	4
Betsey Moodie	1
Robert Morgan	5
Sarah Motte	1
Rhina Neufville	5
Jane Newton	6
John Oliver	4
Elizabeth Phillips	1
Hagar Pickering	1
Laura Purse	4
John Francis Plumeau**	3
Adel Raine	3
Edward Roche	2
Maria Louisa Rogers	1
Adel Richards	5
Juliet Saxon	6
Phillip Saulters	4
Affey Simons	4
Francis Smith	12
Mary Steedman	1
Catherine Steel	2
Hellena J. Stromer	2
Joseph Terry	1
Francis Thatcher	4
Robert Toomer	3
Ann Turner	4
Sarah Turner	5
Maria P. Wall	6
Jacob Weston	3
Samuel Weston	3
Edward White	3
Sarah Wilson	4
Ann Vaughan	5
Carolina Veree	3
Eleanor Elfe	2
Charleston Neck	
Malcolm Brown	10
Isaac Burckmeyer	5
John Bascomb	2
Hestor Barron	9
Catherine Bennett	3
Ellen Bennett	2
Gordon Bing	3
Robert Bing	2
Sarah Bing	1
Flora Campbell	3
Ellen Chichester	2
Jane Cockran	3
Thomas Cockran	2
Cecelia Canless	2
Elizabeth Cambridge	3
William H. Cheney	2
Caroline Dingle	1
Jane Deas	2
Joseph Dereef	10
Richard E. Dereef	11
William C. Dewees	1

Name	Slaves
Elias Gardner	3
Juliana Gregg	1
Ann Gregg	3
Mary Francis	2
Sarah A. Foster	2
Sarah Fowler	1
William Hamlin	4
Eliza Tardiff	2
Charles Haskell	2
Sarah Hemetry	4
John Hoff	3
Edwin Holmes	3
Robert Houston	1
Timothy Hutson	2
Caroline Johnson	2
Caroline Jones	3
Edward Lawrence	4
Louisa Lawrence	2
Emma McCall	5
Louisa McVicer	7
Martha Maxwell	3
Thomas W. Maxwell	4
Eliza Moore	4
Dianah Muns	2
Andrew Neighbour	2
Martin Nelson	2
William Osborne	I
Martha Purse	2
Margaret Pencil	2
Edward Richards	10
Kitty Simmons	2
Mary Sparks & Robert Sparks	3
Francis St. Marks	4
Thomas R. Small	3
Edmund Wilkinson	5
Francis L. Wilkinson	8
Sarah Weston	2
Colleton District	
St. Bartholomew's Parish	
William Jackson	2
St. Paul's Parish	
Daniel Postell*	17
Georgetown District	
Georgetown City	
Hagar Beckman	3
Anna Alston	3
Edward Rainey	1
D.J. Wilson	2
George Pawley	1
J.F. Leribore	7
Winyaw Parish	
Robert Michael Collins	19
Margaret Mitchell Harris	30
Alexander Holmes	12
Benjamin Lewis	1
Horry District	
William Burgess	2
Orangeburgh District	
John Barrs	5
Richard Dempsey	1
Picken District	
Lydia Holly	2
Lucinda Holly	1
Richland District	
Columbia City	
Richard Holmes	1
Sarah Patterson	2
Jesse Rabb	2
Jesse Oscendyne	2
Sumter District	
William Ellison, Sr.	37
Henry Ellison	2
William Ellison, Jr.	I
Reubin Ellison	1
York District	
Jerry Dickey	8

1860

Anderson District	
Benjamin Robert	2
Barnwell District	
John H. Berry	10
Lewis Kinsey	19
Stephen Powel	1
Beaufort District	
St. Luke's Parish	
William Jones	9
James Morrison	8

Name	Slaves
Prince William's Parish	
Peter Jackson	6
Anges Jackson	I
Charleston District	
St. James Santee Parish	
Elias Cumbo	5
St. James Goose Creek Parish	
Lamb Stevens	13
St. John's Berkeley Parish	
John Dangerfield	2
St. Stephen's Parish	
Henry Glencamp	8
Thomas Jefferson	2
Nancy Lewis	7
James Peagler*	25
Margaret Peagler*	23
St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish	
Andrew James Anderson	21
Jacob & Sarah Boag	10
Janet Collins	13
Nelly Collins	10
Charlotte Collins	16
Stanhope Fowler	3
Charleston City**	
Jane Allen	1
Martha Artson	1
Amos Baxter	1
Amos Baxter (trustee)	13
Ann Bentham	4
William Berry	4
Jennette Bonneau	1
Martha Bowen	2
Frederick Brailsford	1
Malcolm Brown	4
Peter Brown	1
Louisa Burke	2
Mary Campbell	5
Mary Castion	1
Matilda Chase	3
Christiana Cleveland	2
Estate of Robert H. Collins	2
Ann Connor	3
Rebecca Cooper	1
Estate of Eliza W. Deas	1
Louisa R. DeCoster	5
William P. DeCoster	3
A[delle] Deletta	3
Samuel T. Demar	2
Joseph Dereef	6
Richard E. Dereef	14
Richard E. Dereef (trustee)	4
Robert Duncan	1
Elizabeth Duprat	12
Maria Elfe	1
Friday Evans	2
Rebecca Elwig	1
Thomas Fanning	1
Virginia Ferrette	6
Henry Fordham	1
Ann Forrest	3
Ann Francis	2
John L. Francis	7
Amelia Franklin	3
Elias Garden	3
Mary Ann Garden	2
Sarah Gaskin	1
Sarah Givens	3
Hannah Gonzales	3
Alfred Grant	4
Ann Grant	1
Robert Hargraves	1
Theresa Hedley	1
John Hoff	1
Charles H. Holloway	1
Cornelius Holloway	2
Frances P. Holloway	2
Richard Holloway	1
Susan A. Holmes	2
Thomas M. Holmes	3
Cynthia Hopkins	1
Robert Howard	5
William Jackson	2
James Drayton Johnson	3
Mary S. Johnson	1
Sally Johnson	4
James Johnston	10
Estate of Jacob Koechler	5
David Lawrence (trustee)	1
Pheobe Lewis	11
Sarah Lincoln	3
Julia Legare	1
Carolina Lubett	4
John B. Mathews	1
Peter B. Mathews	7

Name	Slaves
Estate of Phoebe Mathews	1
Thomas B. Maxwell	2
Emma McCall	2
George McKinlay	2
Stephen McLean	1
Estate of Eliza McNillaye	1
Ann Mitchell	1
Maria Chapman Moore	5
John Morris	5
Hannah Nelson	2
Henry Owens	2
Emma Palmer	2
Edward Palmer	2
Mary H. Parson	3
Margaret Pencil	1
Francis Perry	1
Estate of Robert Perry	1
[John] Francis Plumeau	4
Paul Poinsett & Louisa Johnson	1
Catherine Ranor	5
William Rollins	1
Joseph A. Sasportas	5
Frederick C. Sasportas	2
William W. Seymour	1
J.J. Simms	2
Mary Ann Simms	I
George Shrewsberry	12
Richard Small	1
Thomas Small	3
Thomas Small & James Bright	7
Thomas Small & John Holmes	3
Thomas Small (trustee)	1
Emily Smith	1
Mary Steedman	1
Catherine E. Steele	1
Francis St. Mark	3
M.A. Stroub	1
Rebecca Thorne	2
Harriet Trescott	1
Sarah Vesey	4
Betsey Walker	2
Trust Estate of Ann Jones Walker	2
Maria Weston	14
Jacob Weston	2
Jacob Weston in trust for L. Burke	7
Samuel Weston	1
Samuel Weston (trustee)	2
Samuel Weston (trustee)	8
Harriet Weston	1
Sarah Weston	1
Estate of Jane Wightman	2
Francis L. Wilkinson	4
Richard Wilkinson	3
Ann Williams	1
James Williams	2
John Wilson	1
Willougby Wilson	1
Samuel Austin	6
William Holmes (trustee)	3
Louisa McVicar	5
Charleston Neck	
Edward Fordham	1
Colleton District	
St. Bartholomew's Parish	
William Jackson	2
St. Paul's Parish	
Mary Perry	7
Daniel Postell	3
Edgefield District	
Martha Ardis	1
George Quarles	4
Fairfield District	
Simon Davis	2
Buck Harris	1
Georgetown District	
Georgetown City	
Eliza Davis	2
Alexander Holmes	1
C.B. Mitchell	5
Edward Rainey	1
Hagar Wilson	1
Winyaw Parish	
Robert Michael Collins	17
Margaret Mitchell Harris	1
Martha Williams	1
Lexington District	
Sarah Bower	2
Newberry District	
David Bundrick	2
Wade Sanders	7

Appendix C

Tables for Chapter Six

Table C-1. Free Black Slaveowners Reported on the Federal Census of 1830 with Documentation Suggesting Commercial Slaveownership in Charleston City, South Carolina.

*Listed as a free black in document.

Slaveowner	Transaction documented
1. John Cain	Sold a black woman for $100 in 1843
2. Francoise Perrier*	Sold a black woman and infant for $550 in 1821
3. Mose Brown	Placed a notice for a runaway slave named Moses in 1826
4. William Cooper	Sold a black woman named Jane for $200 in 1825
5. Benjamin T. Huger	Sold a black man named Moses for $330 in 1831
6. Thomas Inglis	Sold a mulatto woman named Linday (20 years old) for $450 in 1830
7. John McBeath	Sold Harriet and her child David for $450 in 1827
8. John Lee	Mortgaged four slaves for $3,200 in 1837
9. Rachael Jackson*	Requested that her slaves be sold in 1840
10. Lydia Watson	Sold a carpenter named Isaac for $450 in 1827
11. George Mathews*	Sold a black woman named Peggy for $215 in 1827
12. Camilla Johnson	Sold a mulatto woman named Diana Todd in 1833 (no price mentioned)
13. Jane Brown	Sold a black woman named Daphne for $500 in 1829
14. Barbara Barquet	Requested that her slaves Isaac, Bella and Diana be sold

15. Sarah Ferguson*	Sold a 35-year-old black woman named Ponder for $190 in 1823
16. William Seymour	Mortgaged five slaves for $1,431 in 1841
17. Mary Smith*	Requested that her slave Polly was to be sold in 1839
18. Rebecca Thorne*	Received wages from her slaves during the 1830s and 1840s
19. Malcolm Brown	Sold a black woman named Isabella and her child for $1,000 in 1839
20. Rosetta Summers	Requested that her slaves Harriet, Sam and Henry be sold
21. Ann May	Requested that her slaves be given to her children in 1847
22. Joseph Barella*	Sold Charlotte and a boy named John Crawly for $850 in 1829
23. Hagar Cole	Mortgaged two slaves for $370 in 1840
24. Julia Eggart*	Requested that her slave Celia be sold in 1833
25. John Francis	Sold three slaves named Betty, Louis & Edward for $800 in 1829
26. Martha Garden	Sold a black woman named Hestor for $220 in 1838
27. Richard Holloway, Sr.	Sold a black woman named Jenny for $450 in 1834
28. James D. Johnson	Sold a mulatto boy named Florence for $660 in 1842
29. Jehu Jones, Jr.	Sold a mulatto woman named Elsey for $750 in 1818
30. Sarah Johnson	Placed a notice for a runaway slave named Hestor in 1836
31. Joseph Humphrey	Sold a black man named Jim for $321 in 1829
32. Richmond Kinloch	Requested that his servant named Peggy be sold in 1839
33. Antonet Langlois	Sold a black girl named Sylvanie for $300 in 1834
34. Elsey Lee*	Received wages from her hired-out slaves during the 1840s
35. Maria Lord	Sold a black woman named Molly for $400 in 1823
36. Ann Mitchell	Sold a black boy named Sampson for $300 in 1827
37. Thomas Small, Sr.	Sold a carpenter named Josiah for $550 in 1834
38. Margaret Shaw	Sold a mulatto woman named Elsey for $750 in 1818
39. Philide Turner	Sold a black woman named Celia for $300 in 1825
40. Samuel Weston	Used a mulatto slave named Henry in his tailor shop in 1842
41. Betsey Walker*	Mortgaged a 30-year-old black woman named Margaret for $800

Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Fifth

Census of the United Slates, 1830: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, pp. 8, 11, 17, 22, 28, 30, 31, 33, 37, 39, 40, 43, 50, 54, 55, 61, 63, 75, 81, 82, 88, 90, 91, 92, 95, 96, 103, 108, 112; Bills of Sale vol. 4P 1817 (Secretary of State), p. 467; Ibid., vol. 4V 1820-1822, p. 225; Ibid., vol. 4X 1822-1823, p. 383; Ibid., vol. 5A 1823-1825, pp. 364, 511; Ibid., vol. 5D 1825-1827, p. 50; Ibid., vol. 5G 1827-1829, pp. 58, 104, 116, 131, 136, 500; Ibid., vol. 5K 1829-1832, pp. 24, 48, 296, 530; Ibid., vol. 50 1832-1836, pp. 489, 498; Ibid., vol. 5T 1836-1839, pp. 192, 304, 549; Ibid., vol. 5W 1839-1843, pp. 408, 468, 590; Charleston Courier, January 21, 1826; Ibid., August 20, 1836; Charleston Mercury, August 21, 1836; Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1848, number 22 (Charleston County); Ibid., Bills 1851, no. 81; Mortgages vol. 3Z 1836-1840 (South Carolina), p. 293; Ibid., vol. 4A 1840-1844, pp. 94, 241; Record of Wills vol. 40 1834-1839 (Charleston County), p. 138; Ibid., vol. 42 1834-1839, pp. 864-866; Ibid., vol. 42 1839-1845, pp. 214-215, 260-262; Ibid., vol. 44 1845-1851, pp. 23-24, 294; Ibid., vol. 46 1851-1856, pp. 46-49.

Table C-2. Free Black Slaveowners Reported on the Tax List of 1859 with Documentation Suggesting Commercial Ownership in Charleston City, South Carolina.

Slaveowner	Transaction documented
1. Esther Barron	Sold Alex, a black male, for $1,000 in 1838
2. Malcolm Brown	Mortgaged Mary and Lavinea for $466.66 in 1854
3. Jennette Bonneau	Slaves provided by her husband to be used as hired out workers
4. Frances P. Bonneau	Slaves provided by her father to be used as hired out workers
5. Mary Castion	Sold Rosine, a black woman, for $400 in 1854
6. R.H. Collins (estate)	Slaves used by his wife as hired-out laborers during the 1850s
7. Rebecca Cooper	Gave Flander, a male slave, as a gift to relatives in 1856
8. William P. DaCosta	Sold Thomas and Billy for $1,000 in 1844
9. Richard E. Dereef	Mortgaged five slaves for $920 in 1852
10. Elias Garden	Mortgaged Sarah, a 3-year-old slave, for $1,200 in 1854
11. John L. Francis	Sold Melishia and her four children for $1,030 in 1850
12. Thomas M. Holmes	Sold a black boy named Peter for $200 in 1846
13. Robert Howard	Mortgaged William, a 22-year-old slave, for $250 in 1841
14. J.D. Johnson	Sold Judy, a 30-year-old woman, for $300 in 1850
15. Sally Johnson	Advertised for Hestor, a runaway, in 1836
16. Jacob Kugley (estate)	Slaves used by daughter as hired-out laborers during the 1850s
17. John B. Mathews	Mortgaged Footman, a black male, for $600 in 1850
18. Ann Mitchell	Sold a 15-year-old boy named Sampson for $300 in 1827

19. Louisa DaCosta	Sold 21 slaves for $6,635 in 1848
20. Henry Fordham	Mortgaged Grace, a servant woman, for $530 in 1852
21. Maria C. Moore	Requested that her slaves Charlotte and Victoria be sold in 1862
22. Eliza McNellaye	Advertised for a runaway slave named Mary in 1859
23. Louisa McVicer	Sold George, a black male, for $970 in 1856
24. Hannah Nelson	Sold a black woman named Binky for $600 in 1855
25. J.A. Sasportas	Sold Maria, a 40-year-old woman, for $300 in 1863
26. F.C. Sasportas	Sold Adeline, a 21-year-old mulatto woman, for $400 in 1851
27. W.W. Seymour	Mortgaged eight slaves for $4,040 in 1842
28. George Shrewsberry	Sold five slaves for $1,100 in 1844
29. Ann J. Walker	Received wages from hired-out slaves during the 1840s and 1850s
30. Betsey Walker	Mortgaged Margaret, a 30-year-old black woman, for $800 in 1842
31. Jacob Weston	Sold a black man named Jack for $350 in 1849
32. Samuel Weston	Sold Tom, a black man, for $550 in 1850
33. Jane Wightman	Mortgaged Dick and Liddy for $200 in 1852
34. Richard Wilkinson	Mortgaged four slaves for $357.15 in 1843
35. Francis L. Wilkinson	Mortgaged four slaves for $294 in 1841
36. Phoebe Lewis	Sold Jane, and 18-year-old woman, for $75 in 1849

Sources: J.R. Honour, List of the Tax Payers of the City of Charleston for 1859 (Charleston: Walker & Evans, 1860), pp. 383-404; Bills of Sale vol. 5G 1827-1829 (Secretary of State), p. 136; Ibid., vol. 5T 1836-1839, p. 359; Ibid., vol. 6A 1843-1846, pp. 211, 321; Ibid., vol. 6B 1846-1849, pp. 62, 342, 505; Ibid., vol. 6C 1849-1853, pp. 92, 107, 115, 138; Ibid., vol. 1853-1857, pp. 288, 427, 611; Ibid., vol. 6E 1857-1863, p. 18; Ibid., vol. 6F 1862-1872, p. 27; Charleston Courier, August 20, 1836; Charleston Mercury, July 6, 1859; Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. F 1852-1853 (Charleston County), pp. 72, 227; Ibid., vol. L 1860-1861, pp. 263-264; Inventories vol. H 1834-1844 (Charleston County), p. 243; Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1843, Number 10.5 (Charleston County); Miscellaneous Records vol. 6D 1849-1851 (Secretary of State), pp. 190-192; Ibid., vol. 6H 1856-1858, p. 2; Mortgages vol. 4A 1840-1844 (South Carolina), pp. 158, 241; Ibid., vol. 48 1841-1848, pp. 58, 63-64, 157-158; Ibid., vol. 4D 1847-1850, p. 646; Ibid., vol. 4G 1852-1854, p. 465; Ibid., vol. 4E 1848-1853, pp. 391, 410, 440-441; Ibid., vol. 4H 1853-1856, p. 134; Record of Wills vol. 39 1826-1834 (Charleston County), pp. 905-907; Ibid., vol. 41 1834-1839, p. 584; Ibid., vol. 49 1856-1862, pp. 752-753; Ibid., vol. 50 1862-1868, pp.

350-353.

Notes

Introduction

1. R. Halliburton, Jr., "Free Black Owners of Slaves: A Reappraisal of the Woodson Thesis," South Carolina Historical Magazine vol. 76 (July 1976), pp. 135-136; Carter G. Woodson, "Free Negro Owners of Slaves in the United States in 1830," Journal of Negro History vol. 9 (January 1924), pp. 6-35.

2. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule 1, St. Landry Parish, Louisiana, p. 929; Ibid., Schedule Il, p. 124; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 13-14 (According to the census, Auguste Donatto owned an estate valued at $68,600 and managed by a white overseer named Charles Sorgner. In Louisiana, there were several mulatto planters who owned large plantations which were managed by white persons); Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Sumter District, South Carolina, p. 80; Ibid., Schedule II, pp. 180-181; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 21-22; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Georgetown County, South Carolina, pp. 300, 309; Ibid., Schedule II, n.p. (see October 21 & 22 slave schedules); Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 701-702.

3. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Iberville Parish, Louisiana, p. 42; Ibid., Schedule!!, pp. 359-360; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 1-2; P.A. Champomier, Statements of Sugar and Rice Crops Made in Louisiana (New Orleans: Cook, Young & Co., 1859), pp. 10-15.

4. Halliburton, "Free Black Owners of Slaves," p. 129 (see chapters 2, 4, and 7).

5. Halliburton, "Free Black Owners of Slaves," p. 130 (Throughout the antebellum South, there were many blacks who owed their slave property to the benevolence of relatives. After the death of Andrew Durnford, his son inherited St. Rosalie Plantation and 74 slaves); Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Plaquemine Parish, Louisiana, p. 32; Ibid., Schedule II, pp. 13-14; David O. Whitten, "A Black Entrepreneur in Antebellum Louisiana," Business History vol. XLI (1971), pp. 204-205 (In 1791, a family of mulatto slave traders who were born in West Africa traveled to South Carolina and established themselves in the districts of Charleston and Georgetown, where they used their imported African slaves to plant

rice. See Chapter Seven).

6. Woodson, "Free Negro Owners of Slaves," p. 42; David Rankin, "The Forgotten People: Free People of Color in New Orleans 1850-1870," (Ph.D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1976), pp. 156-160; Halliburton, "Free Black Owners of Slaves," pp. 130-134.

Chapter One: Free Black Slaveholding and the Federal Census

1. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, First Census of the United States, 1790: Schedule I, St. James & Goose Creek Parish, Charleston District, South Carolina (National Archives, Washington, D.C.), p. 37.

2. Barnes F. Lathrop, "History from the Census Returns." In Sociology and History: Methods, edited by Seymour Martin Lipset and Richard Hofstadter (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968), pp. 79-82.

3. Ronald Vern Jackson and Gary Ronald Teeples, eds., The South Carolina 1840 Census Index (Utah: Accelerated Indexing System, 1977), pp: i-vii; Lathrop, "History from the Census," pp. 80-85.

4. Sixth Census of the United States, 1840: Schedule 1, Charleston Neck, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 100; Bills of Sale vol. 50 1832-1836 (Secretary of State), p. 486 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Ibid., vol. 5T 1836-1839, pp. 1, 134, 340, 359, 400, 420, 498; Ibid., vol. 5W 1839-1843, p. 2.

5. Leonard P. Curry, The Free Black in Urban America 1800-1850: The Shadow of the Dream (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), p. 270.

6. Jackson and Teeples, eds., South Carolina 1840 Census, pp. i-vi; Claudia Dale Goldin, Urban Slavery in the American South 1820-1860: A Quantitative History (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976), p. 133.

7. Goldin, Urban Slavery, p. 41.

8. Robert S. Starobin, ed., Denmark Vesey: The Slave Conspiracy of 1822 (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1970), p.-136.

9. Charleston Courier, December 8, 1835.

10. Clement Eason, "Slave Hiring in the Upper South: A Step Toward Freedom," Mississippi Historical Review vol. 46 (March 1960), p. 673; Goldin, Urban Slavery, pp. 20-25.

11. MSS. Ford Family Papers 26 September 1825, Manuscript Division, Record Group 9, South Caroliniana Library, Columbia, South Carolina; Ibid., 8 June 1826; Bills of Sale vol. 5W 1839-1843 (Secretary of State), p. 408; T.C. Fay, Charleston Directory and Strangers Guide for 1840-1841 (Charleston, 1840), p. 100.

12. Bills of Sale vol. 6B 1846-1849 (Secretary of State), p. 497; Ibid., vol. 6C 1849-1853, p. 313; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 498; J.R. Honour, List of the Tax Payers of the City of Charleston for 1860 (Charleston: Walker & Evans, 1861), p. 327.

13. Sixth Census of the United States, 1840: Schedule I, Georgetown County, South Carolina, p. 320; Ibid., St. James Santee Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 179; Tax Returns of 1824 for Prince George, Georgetown County, Record Number 828 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1847, Record Number 52 (Charleston County), (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Mabel L. Webber, ed., "Dr. John Rutledge and his Descendants," South Carolina Historical & Genealogical Magazine vol. 31 (April 1930), pp. %-97; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, St. James Santee Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 147.

14. Fourth Census of the United States, 1820: Schedule I, Georgetown County, South Carolina, p. 71.

15. Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1847, Record Number 52 (Charleston County); Third Census of the United States, 1810: Schedule I, St. John's Berkeley Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 226.

16. Record of Wills vol. 40 1834-1839, Charleston County, (The Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina) p. 266 (The wills examined were the transcribed copies recorded by the W.P.A.).

17. Carter G. Woodson, "Free Negro Owners of Slaves in the United States in 1830," Journal of Negro History vol. 9 (January 1924), p. 31; F.Y. Porcher, Directory and Strangers Guide for the City

of Charleston for 1831 (Charleston: Irishman, 1831), p. 54; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule 1, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 122.

18. Woodson, "Free Negro Owners of Slaves," pp. 30-31 (The following persons were reported to be free black slaveholders by Carter G. Woodson but were actually white absentee slaveowners: 1. Frances C. Dalton was a native of England and the wife of Dr. James Dalton. When Mrs. Dalton died in 1846, she was buried in the graveyard of St. Michael's Church, which was a segregated cemetery. - Clara Jervey, ed., inscriptions of the Tablets and Gravestones in St. Michael's Church and Church yard Charleston, S.C. (Columbia: State Company, 1906), p. 85. 2. Mistress Lucretia Horry of St. Bartholomews Parish was recorded as white on the 1820 census and listed as a white resident of Charleston City by the local directory. - Fourth Census of the United States, 1820: Schedule I, St. Bartholomews Parish, Colleton County, South Carolina, p. 48; Porcher, Directory for 1831, p. 82. 3. Henry Johnson was listed as a white man in the census of 1810. - Third Census of the United States, 1810: Schedule I, St. Paul's Parish, Colleton County, South Carolina, p. 606. 4. John D. Legare was reported to be a white citizen by the city directory. -Supplement of Charleston Directory for 1836 (Charleston: Dowling, 1836), p. 52. 5. Ephraim Mikell Seabrook was of English ancestry according to Mabel L. Webber. -Mabel L. Webber, "The Early Generations of the Seabrook Family," South Carolina Historical & Genealogical Magazine vol. 17 (January 1916), pp. 63, 67. The other white slaveowners classified as free persons of color were Justine Angel, Martha Ann Mathews, Margaret Stock, Charles Tennent, Nicholas Venning, Robert Yenning, and Daniel J. Waring. - Porcher, Directory for 1831, p. 54; Fifth Census of the United States, 1830: Schedule i, St. George Parish, Colleton County, South Carolina, p. 457; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 134; Negrin's Directory and Almanac for the Year 1806: Containing Every Article of General Utility (Charleston: J.J. Negrin's Press, 1807), p. 76; Record of Wills vol. 401834-1839 (Charleston County), p. 398; Porcher, Directory for 1831, p. 113; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Christ Church Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, pp. 378, 380; Porcher, Directory for 1831, p. 117).

19. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 284; Henrietta P. Jervey, ed., "The Private Register of the Rev. Paul Trapier," South Carolina Historical Magazine vol. 58 (1957), p. 105.

20. Kenneth M. Stampp, The Peculiar Institution: Slavery in the AnteBellum South (New York: Vintage Books, 1956), p. 195.

21. Joel Williamson, New People: Miscegenation and Mulattoes in the United States (New York: Free Press, 1980), p. 18.

22. Winthrop D. Jordan, White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro 1550-1812 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1968), pp. 171-172.

23. Winthrop D. Jordan, "American Chiaroscuro: The Status and Definition of Mulattoes in the British Colonies," William & Mary Quarterly vol. 19 (April 1%2), p. 190.

24. Ibid., p. 191.

25. Duke De La Rouchefoucault Liancourt, Travels Through the United States of North America the Country of the Iroquois and Upper Canada in the Years 1795, 1796, and 1797 (London: R. Phillips, 1799), p. 602.

26. Record of Wills vol. 3 1732-1737 (Charleston County), pp. 240-241; Brent H. Holcomb, ed., "1786 Tax Returns," South Carolina Magazine of Ancestral Research vol. 9 (Spring 1981), p. 73; William Montgomery Clemens, ed., North and South Carolina Marriage Records (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1973), p. 217; Record of Wills vol. 9 1760-1767 (Charleston County), p. 132; Ibid., vol. 26 1793-1800 (Charleston County), pp. 596-598.

27. First Census of the United States, 1790: Schedule I, St. Paul's Parish, Charleston District, South Carolina, p. 37; Second Census of the United States, 1800: Schedule I, St. Paul's Parish, Charleston District, South Carolina, p. 161; Brent H. Holcomb, ed., "Tax Returns 1785," South Carolina Magazine of Ancestral Research, vol. 5 (Summer 1977), p. 160; Holcomb, "1786 Tax Returns," p. 173; Record of Wills vol. 9 1760-1767 (Charleston County), p. 132; Ibid., vol. 26 1793-1800 (Charleston County), pp.-596--5-98.--

28. Miscellaneous Records vol. 4E 1811, 1814, 1816 (Secretary of State), p. 152 (Department of Archives &History, Columbia, South Carolina).

29. Ibid., vol. 5Z 1842-1843 (Secretary of State), p. 260.

30. Ibid., p. 261.

31. Record of Wills vol. 22 1786-1793 (Charleston County), pp. 194-195; Ibid., vol. 14 1771-1774 (Charleston County), pp. 109-110; A.S. Salley, Jr., ed., Register of St. Philip's Parish Charles Town South Carolina 1720-1758 (Charleston: Walker, Evans & Cogswell, 1904), pp. 100, 145.

32. J.S.G. Richardson, Reports of Cases At Law Argued and Determined in the Court of Appeals of South Carolina vol. 3 (Columbia: A.S. Johnston, 1847), pp. 136-140; Record of Wills vol. 3 1828-1853 (Kershaw County), pp. 190-191 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina), Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Kershaw District, South Carolina, p. 128.

33. Miscellaneous Records vol. 6A 1843-1847 (Secretary of State), p. 88.

34. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 223; Record of Wills vol. 49 1856-1862 (Charleston County), p. 752.

35. Miscellaneous Records vol. 4H 1813-1816 (Secretary of State), p. 287; Ibid., vol. 5Y 1840-1842 (Secretary of State), pp. 221-222 (In the document, Adam Garden, a free Indian, swore that Elias Garden was of free Indian heritage).

36. Ira Berlin, Slaves Without Masters: The Free Negro in the Antebellum South (New York: Vintage Books, 1974), p. 164; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1821 (Charleston), (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Miscellaneous Records vol. 5Y 1840-1842 (Secretary of State), p. 268; Ibid., vol. 4Z 1823-1825 (Secretary of State), p. 299; Ibid., vol. 5Z 1842-1843 (Secretary of State), pp. 260-261; Marriage Settlements vol. 4 1801-1805 (South Carolina), pp. 128-129, (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

37. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston Neck, South Carolina, p. 330; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 475; Miscellaneous Records vol. 4Z 1823-1825 (Secretary of State), pp. 269-270 (Even though Joseph Dereef was declared to be a free Indian by the Court of Common Pleas in 1823, he was reported to be a free mulatto by the census taker of 1850).

38. Jordan, "Definition of Mulattoes," p. 198; Stampp, Peculiar Institution, pp. 195-196; Berlin, Slaves Without Masters, p. 163.

Chapter Two: The Numbers and Distribution of Black Slaveholding

1. Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1864 (Charleston), (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I & I!, South Carolina (National Archives, Washington, D.C.); Frederick Ford, Census of the City of Charleston South Carolina for the Year 1861 (Charleston: Walker & Evans, 1861), pp. 315-334; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1863 (Charleston).

2. Miscellaneous Records vol. 3C 1791-1794 (Secretary of State), p. 147 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

3. Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1851, Record Number 81 (Charleston County), (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Seventh Census of the United States, 1850.• Schedule 1, Charleston Neck, South Carolina, p. 305; Fifth Census of the United States, 1830: Schedule !, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 81.

4. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule 1, Charleston Neck, South Carolina, p. 325: Henrietta P. Jervey, ed., "The Private Register of Rev. Paul Trapier," South Carolina Historical Magazine vol. 58 (1957), p. 177; Record of Wills vol. 49 1856-1862 (Charleston County), pp. 866-869 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

5. Sixth Census of the United States, 1840: Schedule I, Charleston Neck, South Carolina, p. 121; Inventories, Appraisements & Sales vol. C 1850-1854 (Charleston County), pp. 102, 258, 261; Sixth Census of the United States, 1840: Schedule 1, Charleston Neck, South Carolina, p. 130; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule 1, St. George Parish, Colleton District, South Carolina, p. 243; Miscellaneous Records vol. 6D 1849-1851 (Secretary of State), p. 71; Ibid., vol. 6A 1843-1847, pp. 259, 358.

6. Bills of Sale vol. 6B 1846-1849 (Secretary of State), p. 342 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 218; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 807; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule !, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 297; Ibid., Schedule !I, p. 439; J.R. Honour, List of the Tax Payers of the City of Charleston for 1860 (Charleston: Walker & Evans, 1861), p. 318.

7. Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1821 (Charleston); Record of Wills vol. 36 1818-1826 (Charleston County), pp. 1123-1125; Bills of Sale vol. 41 1813-1815 (Secretary of State), p. 164; Ibid., vol. 4V 1820-1822, p. 118; Ibid., vol. 4X 1822-1823, p. 235.

8. Charleston Mercury, May 15, 1860.

9. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule 1, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 172; Bills of Sale vol. 6D 1853-1857 (Secretary of State), p. 95; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 223; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 825.

10. Record of Wills vol. 38 1826-1834 (Charleston County), pp. 519-522.

11. Ibid., vol. 33 1807-1818, pp. 1276-1277; Ibid., vol. 411834-1839, pp. 842, 845.

12. Ibid., pp. 584-585; Inventories vol. H 1834-1844 (Charleston County), pp. 243-244; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1827 (Charleston).

13. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule 1, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 212; Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. G 1853-1854 (Charleston County), p. 378 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 223; Charleston Courier, June 26, 1851; Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. G 1853-1854 (Charleston County), p. 15; Inventories vol. D 1854-1857 (Charleston County), p. 102.

14. Miscellaneous Records vol. 4Y 1822-1824 (Secretary of State), pp. 159-60.

15. Inventories, Appraisements & Sales vol. A 1839-1844 (Charleston County), p. 150; Bills of Sale vol. 5A 1823-1825 (Secretary of State), p. 287; Ibid., vol. 50 1832-1836, p. 205; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1832 (Charleston); Bills of Sale vol. 6E 1857-1863 (Secretary of State), p. 85; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 376; Bills of Sale vol. 4P 1817 (Secretary of State), p. 243.

16. see Appendix B.

17. J.L. Dawson and H.W. De Saussure, eds., Census of the City of Charleston, South Carolina for 1848 (Charleston, 1849), pp. 34-35.

18. Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. G 1853-1854 (Charleston County), pp. 94-95.

19. Register of Mesne Conveyance vol. X-13 1857-1858 (Charleston County), p. 273 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Inventories, Appraisement & Sales vol. D 1854-1857 (Charleston County), pp. 299, 440.

20. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, St. Stephens Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 407; Ibid., Schedule II, n.p. (see August 31 of the slave schedule); Ibid., Schedule I, Georgetown County, South Carolina, p. 309; Ibid., Schedule II, n.p. (see October 21 of the slave schedule).

21. Record of Wills vol. 39 1826-1834 (Charleston County), p. 964; Ibid., vol. 36 1818-1826, p. 985.

22. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 209; Bills of Sale vol. 6C 1849-1853 (Secretary of State), p. 115; T.C. Fay, Charleston Directory and Strangers Guide for 1840-1841, (Charleston, 1840), p. 21.

23. Bills of Sale vol. 6E 1857-1863 (Secretary of State), p. 85.

24. Miscellaneous Records vol. 6B 1844-1849 (Secretary of State), pp. 420-421; Bills of Sale vol. 6B 1846-1849 (Secretary of State), p. 216; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 247; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 865; Ibid., Schedule 1, St. Stephens Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 407; Ibid., Schedule 11, n.p. (see August 31 of the slave schedule).

25. Mariana Wikramanayake, A World in Shadow: The Free Blacks in Antebellum South Carolina (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1973), p. 81.

Chapter Three: From Slavery to Freedom to Slaveownership

1. Record of Wills vol. 11671-1724 (Charleston County), p. 50 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Peter H. Wood, Negroes in Colonial South Carolina from 1670 through the Stono Rebellion (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1974), p.

100.

2. John D. Duncan, "Slave Emancipation in Colonial South Carolina," American Chronicle, A Magazine of History, 1 (1972), p. 66.

3. Record of Wills vol. 27 1793-1800 (Charleston County), p. 867; Ibid., vol. 30 1800-1807 (Charleston County), p. 1083.

4. Record of Wills vol. 40 1834-1839 (Charleston County), pp. 436, 439; Ibid., vol. 22 1786-1793 (Charleston County), pp. 136-137; Ibid., vol. 27 1793-1800 (Charleston County), p. 685.

5. Ibid., vol. 24 1786-1793 (Charleston County), p. 1102.

6. Miscellaneous Records vol. 3D 1792-1795 (Secretary of State), p. 284 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Ibid., vol. 30 1799-1803 (Secretary of State), pp. 299-300, 645.

7. Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1848, Record Number 22 (Charleston County), "Testimony of Rebecca Thorne," 22 April 1848, (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); The City Gazette of Charleston, August 13, 1824; Record of Wills vol. 36 1818-1826 (Charleston County), p. 1034.

8. Benjamin Quarles, The Negro in the American Revolution (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1973), pp. 95-96.

9. John Livingston Bradley, "Slave Manumissions in South Carolina, 1820-1860," (M.A. Thesis, University of South Carolina, 1964), p. 56.

10. Record of Wills vol. 28 1800-1807 (Charleston County), pp. 4-6.

11. Ibid., p. 9.

12. Miscellaneous Records vol. 2Z 1789-1792 (Secretary of State), pp. 140-141; Ibid., vol. 2U 1783-1785 (Secretary of State), pp. 155, 169; Ibid., vol. 2Z 1789-1792 (Secretary of State), pp. 131-132.

13. Ibid., vol. 2U 1783-1785 (Secretary of State), pp. 94-95.

14. Record of Wills vol. 27 1793-1800 (Charleston County), p. 674, 788-789.

15. Mariana Wikramanayake, A World in Shadow: The Free Blacks in Antebellum South Carolina (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1973), pp. 22, 45.

16. Ibid., p. 35; H.M. Henry, The Police Control of the Slave in South Carolina, (New York: Negro Universities Press, 1968), p. 193.

17. Wikramanayake, A World in Shadow, p. 36.

18. (Anthony Weston was referred to as Toney Weston by his white customers in Charleston City.) Charleston Mercury, April 8, 1839.

19. Record of Wills vol. 37 1826-1834 (Charleston County), pp. 184-185.

20. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Sixth Census of the United States, 1840: Schedule I, Charleston Neck, South Carolina, p. 100, (National Archives, Washington, D.C.); Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 376; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1827, 1832, 1836, 1840, 1844, 1846 (Charleston), (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

21. Record of Wills vol. 37 1826-1834 (Charleston County), p. 184.

22. Sixth Census of the United States, 1840: Schedule I, Charleston Neck, S.C., p. 101; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule 1, Charleston Neck, S.C., p. 303; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1846 (Charleston).

23. Record of Wills vol. 22 1786-1793 (Charleston County), p. 150; Wikramanayake, A World in Shadow, p. 94; Anne King Gregorie, History of Sumter County (Sumter, South Carolina: Library Board, 1954), p. 134.

24. Record of Wills vol. 40 1834-1839 (Charleston County), pp. 238-239; Directory and Strangers Guide for the City of Charleston for the Year 1822 (Charleston: Schenck, 1822), p. 106.

25. Martin Robinson Delany, The Conditions, Elevation, Emigration and Destiny of the Colored People of the United States (Philadelphia: Author, 1852), p. 108; Charleston Courier, February 13, 1824.

26. Record of Wills vol. 44 1845-1851 (Charleston County), p.

383; Direc- toryfor 1822, pp. 105, 108; Record of Wills vol. 36 1818-1826 (Charleston County), pp. 1008-1009; Ibid., vol. E2 1860-1867 (Sumter County), pp. 116-117 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

27. Miscellaneous Records vol. 4Y 1822-1824 (Secretary of State), pp. 170-171; Bills of Sale vol. 3N 1799-1805 (Secretary of State), p. 381 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Ibid., vol. 41 1813-1815 (Secretary of State), p. 218; Directory for 1822, p. 108.

28. Bills of Sale vol. 3N 1799-1805 (Secretary of State), p. 108; Ibid., vol. 41 1813-1815 (Secretary of State), p. 218; Ibid., vol. 4X 1822-1823 (Secretary of State), p. 328; Inventories vol. G 1824-1834 (Charleston County), pp. 11-13 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Bills of Sale vol. 4X 1822-1823 (Secretary of State), p.328.

29. (On November 7, 1804, Philida Turner was manumitted by her master.) Miscellaneous Records vol. 6B 1844-1849 (Secretary of State), pp. 388-389; Bills of Sale vol. 4F 1811-1813 (Secretary of State), p. 192.

30. Record of Wills vol. 34 1818-1826 (Charleston County), pp. 97-98.

31. Ibid., p. 97.

32. Bills of Sale vol. 4F 1811-1814 (Secretary of State), p. 402; Ibid., vol. 41 1813-1815 (Secretary of State), p. 221.

33. Record of Wills vol. 28 1800-1807 (Charleston County), p. 3.

34. Mortgages vol. 2G 1776-1796 (South Carolina), p. 331 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

35. E. Horace Fitchett, "Traditions of the Free Negro in Charleston, South Carolina," Journal of Negro History vol. 25 (April 1940), pp. 141-142.

36. Joseph W. Barnwell, "Bernard Elliotts Recruiting Journal 1775," South Carolina Historical & Genealogical Magazine vol. 8 (July 1916), pp. 98-99; Willie Pauline Young, ed., Abstracts of Old Ninety Six and Abbeville District Wills and Bonds (Abbeville, S.C., 1950), pp. 128-129; First Census of the United States, 1790. Schedule I, Orangeburgh District, South Carolina, p. 101.

37. Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1843, Record Number 10.5 (Charleston County); Record of Wills vol. 42 1839-1845 (Charleston County), pp. 62-63; J.R. Honour, List of the Tax Payers of the City of Charleston for 1859 (Charleston: Walker & Evans, 1860), p. 402. - - - - -- ---- ----

38. Record of Wills vol. 31 1807-1818 (Charleston County), pp. 265-267; Calvin D. Wilson, "Negroes Who Owned Slaves," Popular Science Monthly vol. LXXXI (1912), p. 490.

39. (In South Carolina, there was a small voice for emancipation. Henry Laurens and his son John Laurens spoke out. Although antislavery arguments were widely heard in the state, many slaveowners, black and white, did not free them.) Clement Easton, The Freedom-of- Thought Struggle in the Old South (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), p. 22.

40. Record of Wills vol. 31 1807-1818 (Charleston County), pp. 265-267; Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1832, Record Number 21 (Charleston County); Bills of Sale vol. 50 1832-1836 (Secretary of State), p. 221; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 184; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 395; Eighth Census of the United States, Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 403; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1860, 1862, 1863, 1864 (Charleston).

41. E. Ophelia Settle, "Social Attitudes During the Slave Regime: Household Servants Versus Field Hands," The American Sociological Society, vol. 28 (December 1933), pp. 95-98; Record of Wills vol. 42 1839-1845 (Charleston County), pp. 260-261; Fifth Census of the United States, 1830: Schedule 1, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 61.

42. Starobin, Denmark Vesey, p. 17.

43. Ibid., p. 48.

44. Herbert Aptheker, American Negro Slave Revolts (New York: International Publishers, 1978), pp. 268-269.

45. Henrietta P. Jervey, ed., "The Private Register of Rev. Paul Trapier," South Carolina Historical Magazine vol. 58 (1957), p. 177; Sixth Census of the United States, 1840: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 115; Bills of Sale vol. 6B 1846-1849 (Secretary of State), p. 186.

46. Record of Wills vol. 49 1856-1862 (Charleston County), p. 867.

47. Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. M 1858-1864 (Charleston County), p. 352 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

48. Stanley Feldstein, Once A Slave: The Slaves' View of Slavery (New York: William Morrow & Company, Inc., 1971), pp. 49-50.

49. Record of Wills vol. 37 1826-1834 (Charleston County), p. 182; Bills of Sale vol. 5T 1836-1839 (Secretary of State), p. 498.

50. Bills of Sale, vol. 50 1832-1836 (Secretary of State), p. 486; Ibid., vol. 5T 1836-1839 (Secretary of State), pp. 134, 340, 400, 498; Ibid., vol. 5W 1839-1843 (Secretary of State), p. 2; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 376; Honour, Tax Payers of the City of Charleston for 1860, p. 332.

Chapter Four: "Buying My Chidrum from Ole Massa"

1. George Rogers, Jr., and David R. Chestnutt, eds., The Papers of Henry Laurens vol. 7, Aug. 1, 1769- Oct. 9, 1771 (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1979), pp. 126-127.

2. Bills of Sale vol. 5A 1823-1825 (Secretary of State), p. 454 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

3. Bills of Sale vol. 4D 1810-1811 (Secretary of State), p. 5; E. Horace Fitchett, "The Free Negro in Charleston, South Carolina," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1950), p. 43 (Maurice Brown was the founder of the African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston. While in the city, he attempted to bridge the gap between the free Negro elite and the less fortunate free coloreds and slaves. But in 1822, he was forced to leave the state and move to Philadelphia for violating the Act of 1822); Mariana Wikramanayake, A World in Shadow: The Free Blacks in Ante-bellum South Carolina (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1973), pp. 74, 87-88.

4. Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1811 (Charleston), (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Bills of Sale vol. 3T 1803-1805 (Secretary of State), p. 350; Ibid., vol. 3X 1805-1808 (Secretary of State), p. 463; Ibid., vol. 41 1813-1815 (Secretary of State), p. 394.

5. Bills of Sale, vol. 3X 1805-1808 (Secretary of State), p. 463;

Ibid., vol. 41 1813-1815 (Secretary of State), p. 394.

6. Ibid., vol. 5D 1825-1827 (Secretary of State), p. 328; Miscellaneous Records vol. 6E 1847-1853 (Secretary of State), p. 596 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

7. Bills of Sale vol. SD 1825-1827 (Secretary of State), p. 53.

8. Ibid., P. 449.

9. Ibid., vol. 41 1813-1815 (Secretary of State), p. 192; Ibid., vol. 4K 1815-1816 (Secretary of State), p. 91.

10. Ulrich Bonnell Phillips, "The Slave Labor Problem in Charleston District," Political Science Quarterly vol. 22 (September 1907), p. 437; Bills of Sale vol. 5A 1823-1825 (Secretary of State), p. 41.

11. Miscellaneous Records vol. 2U 1783-1785 (Secretary of State), p. 187; Bills of Sale vol. 4A 1808-1810 (Secretary of State), p. 373; Phillips, "Slave Labor Problem" pp. 437-438; Robert William Fogel and Stanley L. Engerman, Time On the Cross: The Economics of American Negro Slavery (Boston: Little, Brown, 1974), pp. 73-75, 86-88; Bills of Sale vol. 4D 1810-1811 (Secretary of State), p. 272.

12. Ibid., vol. 2Q 1773-1789 (Secretary of State), p. 514.

13. Record of Wills vol. 39 1826-1834 (Charleston County), p. 1138, (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

14. Charleston Mercury, May 16, 1833.

15. Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1846, Record Number 59 (Charleston County), (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, S.C.).

16. (Both John Francis and John Lee were free coloreds and slaveowners. In 1836, John Francis operated a barbershop on 312 King Street in Charleston City, while John Lee owned a tailor shop on 72 Tradd Street.) Fifth Census of the United States, 1830: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, pp. 33, 78; Supplement to the Charleston Directory for 1836, pp. 108, 109.

17. Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1846, Record Number 59 (Charleston County).

18. Ibid., Bills of Complaint 1846, Record Number 59 (In 1834, Mary Portee, the slave child of John Portee, was a pupil at Mary Ann Seymour's school. Even before the law suit against John Francis and John Lee, the owner of the slave girls allowed them to assimilate into the free black community. After the litigation, the slave children of John Portee paid free Negro taxes and were reported to be free persons of color in 1848. Also Eliza Ann Portee was listed not only as a free black but as the owner of one slave in 1862); Guardian/ Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. A 1834-1841 (Charleston County), pp. 216-217, (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Court of Common Pleas BIAE 1824-0122A (Charleston County), (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1848, 1862 (Charleston).

19. Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1846, Record Number 59.5 (Charleston County).

20. Bills of Sale vol. 5G 1827-1829 (Secretary of State), p. 308; Record of Wills vol. 44 1845-1851 (Charleston County), pp. 109-110; Bills of Sale vol. 50 1832-1836 (Secretary of State), p. 874.

21. Record of Wills vol. 45 1845-1851 (Charleston County), p. 896; Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. F 1852-1853 (Charleston County), p. 116.

22. Bills of Sale vol. 2Q 1773-1789 (Secretary of State), p. 743; Ibid., vol. 3X 1805-1808 (Secretary of State), p. 159.

23. Charleston Mercury, December 27, 1825.

24. Miscellaneous Records vol. 2U 1783-1785 (Secretary of State), pp. 427-428; Ibid., vol. 2Z 1789-1792 (Secretary of State), p. 244; Bills of Sale vol. 5D 1825-1827 (Secretary of State), p. 328; Miscellaneous Records vol. 6E 1847-1853 (Secretary of State), p. 596.

25. Bills of Sale vol. 3N 1799-1805 (Secretary of State), p. 418.

26. William W. Freehling, Prelude To Civil War: The Nulliffication Controversy in South Carolina, 1816-1836 (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), pp. 26-35; Wikramanayake, A World in Shadow, pp. 100-110; Ira Berlin, Slaves Without Masters: The Free Negro in the Antebellum South (New York: Vintage Books,-1976)-,- pp. 222-230.

27. Bills of Sale vol. 3T 1803-1805 (Secretary of State), p. 350;

Ibid., vol. 3X 1805-1808 (Secretary of State), p. 463; Miscellaneous Records vol. 3Y 1806-1809 (Secretary of State), p. 425.

28. Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1823 (Charleston); Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston Neck, South Carolina, p. 303.

29. Bills of Sale vol. 3X 1805-1808 (Secretary of State), p. 15.

30. Record of Wills vol. 40 1834-1839 (Charleston County), pp. 238-239 (Between 1839 and 1841, Hercules Mathews, the grandson of George Mathews, was reported to be a free black by the city tax collectors); Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1839, 1840, 1841 (Charleston).

31. John Livingston Bradley, "Slave Manumissions in South Carolina 1820-1860," (M.A. Thesis, University of South Carolina, 1964), pp. 58-60.

32. Charleston Mercury, October 7, 1833; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1827, 1832 (Charleston); Bills of Sale vol. 5A 1823-1825 (Secretary of State), p. 318; Fifth Census of the United States, 1830: Schedule 1, Charleston Neck, South Carolina, p. 129.

33. Charleston Mercury, October 19, 1835; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1832, 1833, 1836 (Charleston).

34. Court of Common Pleas BIAE 1831-0272A (Charleston County); Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1827, 1832, 1833 (Charleston); Court of Common Pleas BIAS 1839-0134A (Charleston County).

35. Bills of Sale vol. 5G 1827-1829 (Secretary of State), p. 116.

36. Bills of Sale vol. 5T 1836-1839 (Secretary of State), p. 33; Charleston Courier, September 3, 1840.

37. Charleston Courier, September 3, 1840.

38. Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1851, Record Number 75 (Charleston County); Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, St. James & Goose Creek Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 427 (Mr. Christian Alfs was a German immigrant who worked as a castor oil manufacturer on King Street. Shortly after the litigation, the German immigrant died and left behind a small amount of property); Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I,

Charleston Neck, South Carolina, p. 301; Inventories, Appraisements & Sales vol. C 1850-1854 (Charleston County), p. 364 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

39. Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1851, Record Number 75 (Charleston County).

40. Bradley, "Slave Manumissions in South Carolina," pp. 59-62.

41. Ibid.-,-pp.-4647.

42. David J. McCord, ed., The Statutes at Large of South Carolina Containing the Acts from 1814 to 1838 (Columbia: A.S. Johnston, 1839), pp. 194-195.

43. Wikramanayake, A World in Shadow, p. 38.

44. Ibid., pp. 38-39.

45. Petition of James Patterson, Slavery Petitions file 260 (Department of Archives &History, Columbia, South Carolina).

46. Ibid.

47. Ibid.

48. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Columbia City, Richland County, South Carolina, p. 10; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 121.

49. Bills of Sale vol. 5G 1827-1829 (Secretary of State), p. 345; Sara Wells, ed., "Marriages Performed by Rev. Basil Manly," South Carolina Magazine of Ancestral Research vol. 8 (Winter 1980), p. 3; Journal of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of South Carolina for 1829, p. 16 (The Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.).

50. Journal of the House of Representatives for 1836, p. 24.

51. Thomas Cooper, ed., The Statutes at Large of South Carolina (Columbia: A.S. Johnston, 1839), p. 549.

52. Record of Wills vol. 44 1845-1851 (Charleston County), cit., pp. 383-84.

53. Ibid., vol. 39 1826-1834 (Charleston County), p. 1138 (In the will of Peter Parlar, he mentioned that George Wilson was sometimes referred to as George Watkins); Robert S. Starobin, ed., Denmark

Vesey: The Slave Conspiracy of 1822 (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1970), p. 17. Bills of Sale vol. 5A 1823-1825 (Secretary of State), p. 481; Journal of the House of Representatives for 1835, pp. 43, 79.

54. Bradley, "Slave Manumissions in South Carolina," pp. 59-62.

55. Bills of Sale vol. 4V 1820-1822 (Secretary of State), p. 303; Wikramanayake, A World in Shadow, p. 40.

56. Miscellaneous Records vol. 5E 1826-1828 (Secretary of State), p. 103.

57. Ibid., p. 104.

58. Ibid., vol. G 1829-1831, (Secretary of State), pp. 231-232.

59. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Fairfield County, South Carolina, p. 234; Record of Wills vol. E-2 1860-1867 (Sumter County), p. 117 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

60. Miscellaneous Records vol. 5R 1835-1837 (Secretary of State), pp. 217-218.

61. Ibid., vol. 5H 1828-1830 (Secretary of State), pp. 387-388.

62. Ibid., vol. 5N 1831-1835 (Secretary of State), pp. 64-65.

63. Ibid., p. 65.

64. Ibid., vol. 5L 1829-1831 (Secretary of State), p. 130.

65. Bills of Sale vol. 5K 1829-1831 (Secretary-of State), p. 392.

66. Miscellaneous Records vol. 5L 1829-1831 (Secretary of State), pp. 399-400.

67. H. Bailey, ed., Report of Cases Argued and Determined in the Court of Appeals of South Carolina vol. 11 (Charleston: E. Miller, 1834), pp. 137-138.

68. Wikramanayake, A World in Shadow p. 43.

69. Acts of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina for 1841 (Columbia: A.H. Pemberton, 1842), p. 155.

70. Petition of Priscilla Jesszup, Slavery Petitions file 264.

71. Ibid.

72. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I. St. Bartholomews Parish, Colleton County, South Carolina, p. 289; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 336; Petition of William Jackson, Slavery Petitions file 266.

73. Miscellaneous Records vol. 5Y 1840-1842 (Secretary of State), pp. 331-332.

74. Bills of Sale vol. 6A 1843-1846 (Secretary of State), p. 497; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, St. James & Goose Creek Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 427; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 407.

75. Record of Wills vol. 44 1845-1851 (Charleston County), p. 451.

76. Miscellaneous Records vol. 6G 1853-1856 (Secretary of State), pp. 699-700 (Thomas R. Small and John B. Mathews were free persons of color); Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1860, 1863, 1864 (Charleston).

77. Miscellaneous Records vol. 6H 1856-1858 (Secretary of State), p. 50.

78. Ibid., vol. 6K 1860-1868 (Secretary of State), pp. 249-250.

Chapter Five: Neither a Slave Nor a Free Person

1. Bills of Sale vol. 5A 1823-1825 (Secretary of State), p. 53 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1823 (Charleston) (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, S.C.).

2. Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1836, 1840 (Charleston).

3. Bills of Sale vol. 6A 1843-1846 (Secretary of State), p. 38; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1860, 1864 (Charleston).

4. Bills of Sale vol. 6A 1843-1846 (Secretary of State), p. 100; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1860 (Charleston); Ninth Census of the United States, 1870: Scheaule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 413.

5. Bills of Sale vol. 6C 1849-1853 (Secretary of State), p. 11;

Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston Neck, South Carolina, p. 309; J. R. Honour, List of Tax Payers of the City of Charleston for 1859 (Charleston: Walker & Evans, 1860), p. 398.

6. Bills of Sale vol. 6D 1853-1857 (Secretary of State), p. 18; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 502; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1860 (Charleston).

7. Miscellaneous Records vol. 5N 1831-1835 (Secretary of State), pp. 64-65 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1836 (Charleston); Sixth Census of the United States, 1840: Schedule I, Barnwell County, South Carolina, p. 224; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1860 (Charleston); Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 488.

8. Summer Matison, "Manumission by Purchase," Journal of Negro History vol. 32 (1948), p. 153; Mariana Wikramanayake, A World in Shadow: The Free Blacks in Ante-bellum South Carolina (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press), p. 40; Miscellaneous Records vol. 5R 1835-1837 (Secretary of State), p. 375.

9. Miscellaneous Records vol. 5R 1835-1837 (Secretary of State), p. 375.

10. Bills of Sale vol. 50 1832-1836 (Secretary of State), p. 561; Inventories, Appraisements & Sales vol. B 1844-1850 (Charleston County), p. 141 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1845, Record Number 4 (Charleston County) (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

11. H. Bailey, ed., Reports of the Cases Argued and Determined in the Court of Appeals of South Carolina vol. II (Charleston: E. Miller, 1834), pp. 137-138.

12. W.R. Hill, ed., Reports of Cases at Law, Argued in the Court of Appeals of South Carolina (Columbia: n.p., 1834), pp. 423-424.

13. Wikramanayake, A World in Shadow, p. 43.

14. Acts of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina for 1841 (Columbia: A.H. Pemberton, 1842), p. 156.

15. J.S.G. Richardson, ed., Reports of Cases in Equity Argued and Determined in the Court of Appeals and the Court of Errors of South Carolina vol. X (Columbia: Johnston, 1858),.p. 465.

16. Reports of Cases in Equity, vol. 9 (Charleston, 1861), p. 9.

17. Richardson, Reports of Cases in Equity, vol. Ill (Columbia: Johnston, 1852), p. 431.

18. Record of Wills vol. 37 1826-1834 (Charleston County), p. 184 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Sixth Census of the United States, 1830: Schedule I, Charleston Neck, South Carolina, p. 57; Seventh Census of the United States, 1840: Schedule I, Charleston Neck, South Carolina, p. 101; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1840, 1846, 1850 (Charleston); Charleston Courier, January 27, 1852.

19. Sixth Census of the United States, 1830: Schedule 1, Charleston Neck, South Carolina, p. 57; Miscellaneous Records vol. 6B 1844-1849 (Secretary of State), p. 616.

20. Miscellaneous Records vol. 5L 1829-1831 (Secretary of State), p. 441.

21. Henrietta P. Jervey, ed., "The Private Register of the Rev. Paul Trapier," South Carolina Historical Magazine vol. 58 (1959), p. 177; Sixth Census of the United States, 1830: Schedule I, Charleston Neck, South Carolina, p. 100; Seventh Census of the United States, 1840: Schedule I, Charleston Neck, South Carolina, p. 121; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule !, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 378; Honour, Tax Payers of the City of Charleston for 1860, p. 394.

22. Record of Wills vol. 40 1834-1839 (Charleston County), pp. 202-204; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 522.

23. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule IV, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 371; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 493; Ibid., Schedule I, p. 522.

24. Record of Wills vol. 37 1826-1834 (Charleston County), pp. 184-185; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 376; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 461; Honour, Tax Payers of the City of Charleston for 1860, p. 332.

25. (In 1836, Hannah Gonzalez and her children were freed from bondage by their owner, Basilio Gonazlez. According to a deed of trust, they were transferred to Henry Frost and Frederick Winthrop for the nominal sum of five dollars. However, the trust stipulated that "the said female slave Hannah should be unrestrained in the Government and disposal of herself and children and the appropriation of any monies arising from her or their personal industry as if she or they were manumitted, emancipated from the bond of slavery.") Miscellaneous Records vol. 6A 1844-1849 (Secretary of State), pp. 389-390; Bills of Sale vol. 6E 1857-1863 (Secretary of State), pp. 223, 251, 252.

26. Record of Wills vol. 40 1834-1839 (Charleston County), pp. 238-39.

27. Ibid., pp. 238-239; Charleston Courier, September 4, 1841.

28. Charleston Courier, September 4, 1981.

29. Ibid.

30. Bills of Sale vol. 5K 1829-1832 (Secretary of State), p. 350; Charleston Mercury, May 28, 1833.

31. Charleston Mercury, May 28, 1833.

32. Miscellaneous Records vol. SE 1826-1828 (Secretary of State), p. 265; Ibid., vol. 5Z 1842-1843 (Secretary of State), p. 546.

33. Miscellaneous Records vol. 6B 1844-1849 (Secretary of State), pp. 388-389, 654.

34. James Johnson to Henry Ellison, 20 April 1860, Ellison Family Papers (South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina).

35. Ibid.

36. Charleston Courier, August 9, 1860.

37. James Johnson to Henry Ellison, 20 April 1860, Ellison Family Papers.

38. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule !, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 488; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1860, 1864 (Charleston).

39. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 278; Honour, Tax Payers of the City of Charleston for 1860, p. 332; Record of Wills vol. 42 1839-1845 (Charleston County), p. 62; Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1843, Record Number 10.5 (Charleston County); Eighth Census of the United States, 1860; Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 522; Record of Wills vol. 40 1834-1839 (Charleston County), pp. 203-204.

Chapter Six: The Woodson Thesis: Fact or Fiction?

I. R. Halliburton, Jr., "Free Black Owners of Slaves: A Reappraisal of the Woodson Thesis," South Carolina Historical Magazine vol. 76 (July 1976), pp. 129-135.

2. Carter G. Woodson, "Free Negro Owners of Slaves in the United States in 1830," Journal of Negro History vol. 9 (January 1924), p. 42.

3. John Hope Franklin, From Slavery to Freedom: A History of Negro Americans (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1974), p. 173.

4. Ira Berlin, Slaves Without Masters: The Free Negro in the Antebellum South (New York: Vintage Books, 1974), p. 273.

5. Halliburton, "Free Black Owners of Slaves," pp. 130-135.

6. Luther P. Jackson, Free Negro Labor and Property Holding in Virginia, 1830-1860 (New York: Russell & Russell, 1942), pp. 224-225.

7. David Rankin, "The Forgotten People: Free People of Color in New Orleans 1850-1870," (Ph.D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1976), pp. 155-156.

8. Bills of Sale vol. 4M 1816-1818 (Secretary of State), p. 225 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Ibid., vol. 4V 1820-1822 (Secretary of State), p. 295; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1821, 1822 (Charleston) (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

9. Bills of Sale vol. 1822-1823 (Secretary of State), p. 40.

10. Miscellaneous Records vol. 5H 1828-1830 (Secretary of State), pp. 88-92 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

11. Inventories vol. A 1838-1844 (Charleston County), p. 358 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

12. Bills of Sale vol. 5G 1827-1829 (Secretary of State), p. 467; Record of Wills vol. 40 1834-1839 (Charleston County), p. 241 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

13. Inventories vol. H 1834-1844 (Charleston County), pp. 114-115; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1839 (Charleston).

14. Summer Matison, "Manumission by Purchase," Journal of Negro History vol. 32 (1948), p. 153; Bills of Sale vol. 50 1832-1836 (Secretary of State), p. 554; Ibid., vol. 5T 1836-1839 (Secretary of State), p. 338.

15. Record of Wills vol. 42 1839-1845 (Charleston County), p. 214.

16. Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. A 1838-1841 (Charleston County), pp. 487-488 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Inventories, Appraisements & Sales vol. 2 1839-1844 (Charleston County), pp. 178, 235; Charleston Courier, December 10, 1840.

17. Woodson, "Free Negro Owners of Slaves," p. 42.

18. Ibid.

19. Bills of Sale vol. 3P 1800-1801 (Secretary of State), p. 281; Ibid., vol. 3T 1803-1805 (Secretary of State), p. 554.

20. Bills of Sale vol. 50 1832-1836 (Secretary of State), pp. 430, 667; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1822 (Charleston); Bills of Sale vol. 2Q 1773-1789 (Secretary of State), pp. 290, 424; Ibid., vol. 3N 1799-1805 (Secretary of State), p. 235.

21. Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1839, Record Number 28 (Charleston County), (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

22. Ibid.

23. Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1845, Record Number 102 (Charleston County).

24. Ibid., 1820, No. 13; Ibid., 1834, No. 20, 55-56; Ibid., 1835,

No. 37; Ibid., 1845, No. 4; Ibid., 1848, No. 22; Ibid., 1850, No. 34; Ibid., 1851, No. 81.

25. Ibid., 1848, No. 13.

26. Mortgages vol. 301809-1813 (South Carolina), p. 94 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia South Carolina); Ibid., vol. 3T 1822-1826, p. 77; Ibid., vol. 3L 1800-1808, pp. 129-130; Ibid., vol. 4A 1840-1844, p. 491.

27. Bills of Sale vol. 6A 1843-1846 (Secretary of State), p. 541; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1840 (Charleston).

28. Marriage Settlements vol. 11785-1792 (South Carolina), p. 365 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

29. Ibid.,vol. 14 1838-1841, pp. 249-253, 323-324.

30. Record of Wills vol. 36 1818-1826 (Charleston County), p. 1031; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1823 (Charleston).

31. Record of Wills vol. 39 1826-1834 (Charleston County), pp. 951-952; A.S. Salley, Jr., ed., Register of St. Philip's Charles Town South Carolina 1720-1758 (Charleston: Walker & Evans, 1904), pp. 100, 145; Record of Wills vol. 14 1771-1774 (Charleston County), p. 109; Marriage Settlements vol. 1 1785-1792 (South Carolina), p. 646.

32. Bills of Sale vol. 5K 1829-1832 (Secretary of State), p. 545; Record of Wills vol. 36 1818-1826 (Charleston County), pp. 1057-1058; Bills of Sale vol. 5G 1827-1829 (Secretary of State), pp. 219-220; The Directory and Stranger's Guide for the City of Charleston for the Year 1819 (Charleston: Schenck & Turner, 1819), p. 48.

33. Record of Wills vol. 22 1786-1793 (Charleston County), p. 67.

34. Ibid., p. 68.

35. Ibid., vol. 37 1826-1834, pp. 196-200; Inventories vol. G 1824-1834 (Charleston County), p. 200; Estate Papers, Probate Court, Bundle 146, Record Number 11 (Barnwell County), (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

36. Record of Wills vol. 45 1845-1851 (Charleston County), p. 896; Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. F 1852-1853 (Charleston County), p. 116; Record of Wills vol. 44 1845-1851

(Charleston County), p. 294; Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. F 1852-1853 (Charleston County), p. 412; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 200.

37. Berlin, Slaves Without Masters, p. 234.

38. Bills of Sale vol. 5A 1823-1825 (Secretary of State), p. 44; Charleston Courier, January 21, 1826; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1821 (Charleston); Marriage Settlements vol. 11 1833-1835 (South Carolina), pp. 51-55; Charleston Mercury, November 26, 1833.

39. Bills of Sale vol. 4P 1817 (Secretary of State), p. 297.

40. Ibid., vol. SD 1825-1827, p. 289; Ibid., vol. 50 1832-1836, p. 519; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1832, 1834 (Charleston); Bills of Sale vol. 5T 1836-1839 (Secretary of State), p. 498; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1840 (Charleston).

41. Charleston Courier, August 20, 1836.

42. Charleston Mercury, July 6, 1859; Bills of Sale vol. 6D 1853-1857 (Secretary of State), p. 127; J.R. Honour, List of the Tax Payers of the City of Charleston for 1859 (Charleston: Walker & Evans, 1860), p. 398.

43. Sixth Census of the United States, 1840: Schedule I, St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 189; Charleston Mercury, May 22, 1840.

44. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Georgetown County, South Carolina, p. 309; Charleston Courier, March 9, 1849.

45. Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. F 1852-1853 (Charleston County), pp. 72, 227; Ibid., vol. 1 1856-1858, pp. 126-127.

46. Bills of Sale vol. 4P 1817 (Secretary of State), pp. 352-353; Ibid., vol. 5K 1829-1832, pp. 128-129; Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint, 1850, Record Number 34 (Charleston County).

47. Record of Wills vol. 40 1834-1839 (Charleston County), p. 138.

48. Inventories, Appraisements & Sales vol. C 1850-1854 (Charleston County), p. 229.

49. Record of Wills vol. 31 1807-1818 (Charleston County), pp. 223-228; Inventories vol. E 1810-1818 (Charleston County), p.-9.-

50. Miscellaneous Records vol. 5Z 1842-1843 (Secretary of State), p. 257; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1836, 1840 (Charleston).

51. Fifth Census of the United States, 1830: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 88; Sixth Census of the United States, 1840: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 69.--

52. Record of Wills vol. 1845-1851 (Charleston County), pp. 23-24.

53. Inventories, Appraisements & Sales vol. B 1844-1850 (Charleston County), pp. 207-208; Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. E 1846-1852 (Charleston County), pp. 93-94.

54. Record of Wills vol. 40 1834-1839 (Charleston County), p. 62.

55. Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1821 (Charleston); Inventories vol. H 1834-1844 (Charleston County), p. 46; Guardian/ Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. A 1838-1841 (Charleston County), pp. 140-141; Mortgages vol. 4A 1840-1844 (South Carolina), p. 663; Bills of Sale vol. 6A 1843-1846 (Secretary of State), pp. 504-505.

56. Record of Wills vol. 27 1793-1800 (Charleston County), p. 745; Ibid., vol. 33 1807-1818, pp. 999-1000.

57. Record of Wills vol. 36 1818-1826 (Charleston County), p. 992.

58. Ibid., vol. 39 1826-1834, pp. 960-971; Charleston Courier, December 29, 1831; Inventories vol. G 1824-1834 (Charleston County), p. 501; Bills of Sale vol. 50 1832-1836 (Secretary of State), pp. 326, 644; Miscellaneous Records vol. 5Z 1842-1843 (Secretary of State), p. 339.

59. Miscellaneous Records vol. 5Z 1842-43 (Secretary of State), p. 339-40.

60. Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. E 1846-1852 (Charleston County), pp. 90, 129.

61. Halliburton, "Free Black Owners of Slaves," p. 141.

62. Fifth Census of the United States, 1830: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 108; Inventories vol. C 1850-1854 (Charleston County), p. 234; Bills of Sale vol. 4X 1822-1823 (Secretary of State), p. 190; Record of Wills vol. 46 1851-1856 (Charleston County), pp. 47-48.

63. Fifth Census of the United States, 1830: Schedule 1, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 31; Inventories vol. G 1824-1834 (Charleston Counth), pp. 422-423; Record of Wills vol. 38 1826-1834 (Charleston County), pp. 769-770; Bills of Sale vol. 5G 1827-1829 (Secretary of State), pp. 51, 131.

64. Fifth Census of the United States, 1830: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 75; Bills of Sale vol. 5K 1829-1832 (Secretary of State), p. 6; Ibid., vol. 501832-1836, p. 489; Fifth Census of the United States, 1830: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 95; Bills of Sale vol. 50 1832-1836 (Secretary of State), p. 420; Ibid., vol. 5T 1836-1839, p. 268.

65. Berlin, Slaves Without Masters, p. 305; Rules and Regulations of the Brown Fellowship Society, Established at Charleston, South Carolina, November 1, 1790 (Charleston: J.B. Nixon, 1844), p. 26; Bills of Sale vol. 4F 1811-1814 (Secretary of State), p. 319; Ibid., vol. 4P 1817, pp. 31, 362, Ibid., vol. 4V 1820-1822, p. 64; Ibid., vol. 4X 1822-1823, pp. 259, 337, 340; Ibid., vol. 5A 1823-1825, p. 68; Ibid., vol. 5K 1829-1832, p. 97; Mortgages vol. 3R 1818-1822 (South Carolina), p. 190; Ibid., vol. 3T 1822-1826, p. 151.

66. Record of Wills vol. 39 1826-1834 (Charleston County), p. 905.

67. Ibid., p. 906.

68. Woodson, "Free Negro Owners of Slaves," pp. 42-44; Rules and Regulations of the Brown Fellowship Society, pp. 25-27.

69. see Appendix A

70. Kenneth M. Stampp, The Peculiar Institution: Slavery in the AnteBellum South (New York: Vintage Books, 1956), p. 234.

71. Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, s.v. "benevolent."

72. John F. Bayliss, ed., Black Slave Narratives (New York:

Collier Books, 1970), p. 50..--

73. Bills of Sale vol. 5K 1827-1829 (Secretary of State), p. 308; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1827, 1832 (Charleston); Bills of Sale vol. 5K 1827-1829 (Secretary of State), p. 48.

74. Bills of Sale vol. 5K 1827-1829 (Secretary of State), p. 204; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1821, 1822, 1823, 1827 (Charleston).

75. see Appendix C

Chapter Seven: White Rice, White Cotton, Brown Planters, Black Slaves

1. Peter H. Wood, Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina from 1670 through the Stono Rebellion (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1974), pp. 35-40; William B. lees, Limerick Old and in the Way: Archeological Investigations at Limerick Plantation (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1980), p. 43.

2. Wood,-Black. Majority,-pp.- 110-111.

3. Lee, Limerick, pp. 43, 56-57.

4. Wood, Black Majority, pp. 59-62; David C. Littlefield, Rice & Slaves: Ethnicity & the Slave Trade in Colonial South Carolina (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981), pp. 76-80, 92-98.

5. David Doar, Rice and Rice Planting in South Carolina Low Country (Charleston: Charleston Museum, 1936), p. 41; William W. Freehling, Prelude to Civil War: The Nullification Controversy in South Carolina, 1816-1836 (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1968), pp. 9-12; Duncan Clinch Heyward, Seed From Madagascar (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1937), pp. 28-29.

6. Henry Savage, Jr., River of the Carolinas: The Santee (New York: Rhinehart & Company, 1956), pp. 19-20; J.H. Easterby, ed., The South Carolina Rice Plantation As Revealed in the Papers of Robert F. W. Allston (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945), pp. 20-25; Freehling, Prelude to Civil War, p. 11.

7. Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1833, Record Number 34 (Charleston County), "Testimony of George Parker," 1 March 1819 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Ibid., "Testimony of Stile Edward Lightbourn," 10 September 1823; Register of Conveyance vol. M-8 1815-1816 (Charleston County), pp. 298-299

(Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1847, Record Number 52 (Charleston County), "Report of James W. Gray," 3 July 1846; Miscellaneous Records vol. 5Z 1842-1843 (Secretary of State), pp. 64-65 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

8. Charleston Courier, November 23, 1847; Inventories vol. C 1793-1800 (Charleston County), pp. 344-345 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Georgetown County, South Carolina, p. 314; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 13-14; Ann King Gregories, The History of Sumter County (Sumter, 1954), p. 110.

9. Bills of Sale vol. 4S 1819-1820 (Secretary of State), p. 92 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Inventories, Appraisements & Sales vol. B 1844-1850 (Charleston County), pp. 313-315, 394; Miscellaneous Records vol. 61 1858-1861 (Secretary of State), pp. 421-422; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule i, Georgetown County, South Carolina, p. 314; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 13-14.

10. Heyward, Seed From Madagascar, pp. 28-30; Doar, Rice and Rice Planting, pp. 13-14.

11. Kenneth M. Stampp, The Peculiar Institution: Slavery in the AnteBellum South (New York: Vintage Books, 1956), p. 48; Heyward, Seed From Madagascar, p. 31.

12. Heyward, Seed From Madagascar, pp. 31-33; 36-40.

13. Ibid., pp. 40-42.

14. Ibid., pp. 41-42.

15. Ibid., p. 42; Doar, Rice and Rice Planting, pp. 18-20.

16. Wood, Black Majority, pp. 61-62.

17. Clement Eaton, the Growth of Southern Civilization 1790-1860 (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1963), pp. 200-202; Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1847, Record Number 52 (Charleston County).

18. Easterby, ed., South Carolina Rice Plantation, pp. 346-347; Robert William Fogel and Stanley L. Engerman, Time on the Cross: The Economics of the American Negro Slavery (Boston: Little, Brown,

1971), p. 208.

19. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule IV, St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, pp. 357-258; Ibid., Schedule IV, Georgetown County, South Carolina, pp. 13-14 (In 1859, Andrew James Anderson of St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish grew 13,200 pounds of rice, while his cousin Robert Michael Collins plated 90,000 pounds of rice); Easterby, ed., South Carolina Rice Plantation, p. 346; Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1847, Record Number 52 (Charleston County).

20. Easterby, ed., South Carolina Rice Plantation, pp. 347-348; Guion Griffis Johnson, A Social History of the Sea Islands with Special Reference to St. Helena Island South Carolina (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1930), pp. 87-88; Heyward, Seed of Madagascar, p. 181; Fogel and Engerman, Time on the Cross, pp. 116-118; Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1847, Record Number 52 (Charleston County); Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. L 1860-1861 (Charleston County), pp. 399-400 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

21. Easterby, ed., South Carolina Rice Plantation, p. 348; Fogel and Enger- man, Time on the Cross, pp. 115-116; Charleston Mercury, January 7,1839; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule II, St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, pp. 395-396; Ibid., Schedule I, p. 184; Ibid., Schedule II, St. Stephens Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 385; Ibid., Schedule i, p. 177; Ibid., Schedule II, St. John's Berkeley Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 356; Ibid., Schedule i, p. 158; Ibid., Schedule 11, Georgetown County, South Carolina, p. 134; Ibid., Schedule I, p. 314 (In 1860, the colored rice planters A.J. Anderson, Sarah Boag, Janet Collins, Nelly Collins, R.M. Collins, John Dangerfield, Henry Glencamp, and Nancy Lewis held 90 slaves who lived in 20 slave houses, or 4.4. persons per dwelling).

22. Sherman L. Ricards and George M. Blackburn, "A Demographic History of Slavery: Georgetown County, South Carolina, 1850," South Carolina Historical Magazine vol. 76 (October 1975), p. 220.

23. Easterby, ed., South Carolina Rice Plantation, p. 30.

24. Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1847, Record Number 52 (Charleston County); Easterby, ed., South Carolina Rice Plantation, p. 151.

25. Record of Wills vol. 3 1732-1737 (Charleston County), pp. 240-242.

26. Brent H. Holcomb, ed., "1786 Tax Returns," South Carolina Magazine of Ancestral Research vol. IX (Spring 1981), p. 73; First Census of the United States, 1790: Schedule I, St. Paul's Parish, Charleston District, South Carolina, p. 37; Inventories vol. C 1792-1800 (Charleston County), pp. 344-345.

27. David O. Whitten, "Antebellum Sugar and Rice Plantations, Louisiana and South Carolina: A Profitability Study," (Ph.D. dissertation, Tulane University, 1970), pp. 44-45.

28. Inventories vol. C 1792-1800 (Charleston County), pp. 344-345.

29. Record of Wills vol. 26 1793-1800 (Charleston County), pp. 596-597; Second Census of the United States, 1800: Schedule I, St. Paul's Parish, Colleton County, S.C., p. 161; Inventories vol. C 1792-1800 (Charleston County), p. 345.

30. Inventories vol. A 1787-1793 (Charleston County), pp. 491-492; Record of Wills vol. 22 1786-1793 (Charleston County), p. 83.

31. General Assembly Petition 1791 (South Carolina), Record Number 10-003-1791-151 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1803 Record Number 15 (Charleston County), "Testimony of Daniel McNeill," 9 August 1805.

32. Ibid., "Testimony of Augustine Beaudeguin," 4 February 1802; George C. Rogers, Jr., and David R. Chesnutt, eds., The Papers of Henry Laurens volume eight: Oct. 10, 1771- April19, 1773 (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1980), p. 451; Ibid., p. 344.

33. Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1803, Record Number 15 (Charleston County), "Inventory of John Holman," 21 January 1793.

34. Ibid., "Testimony of Daniel McNeill," 9 August 1805.

35. George C. Rogers, Jr., and David R. Chestnutt, eds., The Papers of Henry Laurens volume seven: Aug. 1, 1769- Oct. 9, 1771 (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1979), p. 344.

36. General Assembly Petitions 1791 (South Carolina), Record Number 10-003-1791-151.

37. Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1803, Record Number 15 (Charleston County), "Testimony of Augustine Beaudeguin," 4 February 1802; Record of Wills vol. 24 1786-1793 (Charleston County), pp. 1076-1077; Daniel P. Mannix and Malcolm Cowley, Black Cargoes: A History of the Atlantic Slave Trade 1518-1865 (New York: Penguin Books, 1978), p. 79; Substance of Report Delivered by the Court of Directors of Sierra Leone Company to the General Court of Proprietor On Thursday the 27 March 1794 (London: James Phillips & George Yard, 1794), pp. 92-94.

38. Mannix and Cowley, Black Cargo, pp. 182-186; WE. Burghardt DuBois, The Suppression of the African Slave-Trade to the United States of America 1638-1870 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1965), p. 102.

39. Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1803, Record Number 15 (Charleston County), "Testimony of Henry Laurens, Jr.," Christopher Fyfe, A History of Sierra Leone (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962), p. 17.

40. Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1803, Record Number 15 (Charleston County), "Testimony of William Bowman Bland," 13 February 1802.

41. Viscountess Knutsford, Life and Letters of Zachary Macaulay (London, 1901), pp. 126, 212; Mannix and Cowley, Black Cargo, pp. 185-190.

42. General Assembly Petitions 1791 (South Carolina), Record Number 10-003-1791-151.

43. Journal of the Senate of the Legislature of South Carolina for 1791, p. 5 (Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.); General Assembly Petition 1791 (South Carolina), Record Number 10-004-1791-125.

44. Journal of the Senate of South Carolina 1791,-p. 17.

45. Thomas Cooper, ed., The Statutes at Large of South Carolina (Columbia: Johnston, 1839), p. 183.

46. Master of Equipty, Bills of Complaint 1803, Record Number 15 (Charleston County), "Testimony of John Holman, Jr.," 27 September 1803.

47. Record of Wills vol. 24 1786-1793 (Charleston County), pp. 1076-1078.

48. Cooper, ed., Statues of South Carolina, pp. 183, 248 (Although it was not until 1794 that the state assembly banned the importation of free blacks into South Carolina, it is uncertain whether the children of John Holman, Sr., came into the state as free persons or as slaves. But when he declared his children to be free in 1792, their liberty could not be withdrawn).

49. Inventories vol. C 1793-1800 (Charleston County), pp. 8-9; Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1807, Record Number 53 (Charleston County); Ibid., Bills of Complaint 1833, Record Number 34, "Testimony of Stile Edward Lightbourn," 10 September 1823.

50. Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1803, Record Number 15 (Charleston County), "Testimony of Henry Laurens, Jr."

51. Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1833, Record Number 34 (Charleston County), "Testimony of Samuel Parker," 1 March 1819; Ibid., "Testimony of Stile Edward Lightbourn," 10 September 1823.

52. Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1833, Record Number 34, 'Testimony of Stile Edward Lightbourn," 10 September 1823.

53. Ibid., "Testimony of Samuel Parker," 1 March 1819; Ibid., "Testimony of Stile Edward Lightbourn," 10 September 1823.

54. Ibid., "Testimony of Stile Edward Lightbourn," 10 September 1823 (In 1806, the annual per-pound price of rice was 3.611; therefore the gross revenue made from the rice planted was between $5,775.97 and $10,266.84); Freehling, Prelude to Civil War, p. 361.

55. Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1807, Record Number 53 (Charleston County); Ibid., "Testimony of Stile Edward Lightbourn," 10 September 1823.

56. Ibid., Bills of Complaint 1823, Record Number 48, "Decree," March 1823.

57. Ibid., Bills of Complaint 1807, Record Number 53, "Testimony of Stile Edward Lightbourn," 10 September 1823.

58. Mortgages vol. 3M 1804-1809 (South Carolina), p. 100 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Ibid., vol. 3L 1800-1808, pp. 414-416; Master of Equity, Decrees 1823,

Record Number 48 (Charleston County); Miscellaneous Records vol. 4R 1819-1820 (Secretary of State), p. 367 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

59. Record of Wills vol. 36 1818-1826 (Charleston County), p. 920.

60. Ibid., p. 92 1.

61. Master of Equity. Bills of Complaint 1803, Record Number 15 (Charleston County); Ibid., Bills of Complaint 1807, Record Number 53 (Charleston County); Record of Wills vol. 41 1834-1839 (Charleston County), pp. 516-518.

62. Record of Wills vol. 41 1834-1839 (Charleston County), pp. 516-517, 759-760; Miscellaneous Records vol. 5Z 1842-1843 (Secretary of State), pp. 64-65; Register of Conveyance vol. M-8 1815-1816 (Charleston County), pp. 298-299; Record of Wills vol. 33 1807-1818 (Charleston County), p. 1341; Inventories vol. E 1810-1818 (Charleston County), p. 471.

63. Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1847, Record Number 52 (Charleston County), "Testimony of Jacob Cohen," 25 June 1844; Tax Returns of 1824 for Prince George Parish, Georgetown District, South Carolina, Record Number 824 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Mortgages vol. 3M 1804-1809 (South Carolina), p. 29; Ibid., vol. 3P 1813-1818, p. 78; Ibid., vol. 3R 1818-1822, p. 149; Ibid., vol. 3P 1813-1818, p. 270; Ibid., vol. 4S 1819-1820, p. 92; Fourth Census of the United States, 1820: Schedule I, Georgetown County, South Carolina, p. 74; Sixth Census of the United States, 1840: Schedule I, Georgetown County, South Carolina, p. 320.

64. Sixth Census of the United States, 1840: Schedule I, Georgetown County, South Carolina, p. 320; Fourth Census of the United States, 1820.• Schedule !, Georgetown County, South Carolina, p. 74.

65. Ricards and Blackburn, "A Demographic History of Slavery," pp. 220-224.

66. Register of Conveyance vol. W-2 1846 (Charleston County), pp. 353-354; Miscellaneous Records vol. 4R 1819-1820 (Secretary of State), pp. 200-201; Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1847, Record Number 52 (Charleston County).

67. Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1847, Record Number 52 (Charleston County), "Wills of Elias Collins."

68. Ibid., "Testimony of Jacob Cohen," 25 June 1844; Ibid., "Decree," 5 July 1844.

69. Ibid., "Decree," 5 July 1844; Ibid., "Report of James W. Gray," 3 July 1846.

70. Marriage Settlements vol. 16 1844-1848 (South Carolina), pp. 212-214 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1847, Record Number 52 (Charleston County), "Testimony of Jacob Cohen," 25 June 1844; Winyah Observer, June 15, 1844.

71. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Georgetown County, South Carolina, pp. 300, 309; Ibid., Schedule II, n.p. (The census taker did not record the page numbers of the slave schedules for Georgetown and Charleston City, but the date of the enumeration was listed; see October 22); Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 701-702.

72. Randolph Campbell, "The Productivity of Slave Labor in East Texas: A Research Note," Louisiana Studies vol. 13 (Summer 1974), pp. 155-156.

73. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule II, Georgetown County, South Carolina, n.p. (see October 21); Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 421-422.

74. Ibid., Schedule!, pp. 300, 309; Ibid., Schedule II, n.p. (see October 22); Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 701-702; Ulrich Bonnell Phillips, "The Slave Labor Problem in Charleston District," Political Science Quarterly vol. 22 (September 1907), p. 434.

75. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule IV, Georgetown County, South Carolina, pp. 701-702; Freehling, Prelude to Civil War, p. 362.

76. Alfred H. Conrad and John R. Meyer, "The Economics of Slavery in the Antebellum South," in Hugh G.J. Aitken, ed., Did Slavery Pay? Readings in the Economics of Black Slavery in the United States (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1971), pp. 148-149; Eaton, Growth of Southern Civilization, pp. 200-202; Stampp, Peculiar Institution, pp. 383-390; Whitten, "Antebellum Sugar and Rice Plantations," pp. 106-110.

77. Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. D 1847-1849 (Charleston County), pp. 275-279, 436-440; Ibid., vol. E 1846-1852, pp. 93-94.

78. Miscellaneous Records vol. 61 1858-1861 (Secretary of State), pp. 421-422.

79. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Georgetown County, South Carolina, p. 314; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 134; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 13-14.

80. (In 1859, the interest rate in Charleston City varied from 5 to 6 percent in the City); Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. L 1860-1861 (Charleston County), pp. 263-264.

81. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 384; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 267; Record of Wills vol. 34 1818-1826 (Charleston County), p. 411; Fourth Census of the United States, 1820: Schedule I, St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 110; Tax Returns of 1824 for St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, Record Number 3257; Record of Wills vol. 33 1807-1818 (Charleston County), p. 1341; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule IV, St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, pp. 337-338.

82. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 184; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 395; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 357-358.

83. Miscellaneous Records vol. 5Z 1842-1843 (Secretary of State), p. 259.

84. Record of Wills vol. 41 1834-1839 (Charleston County), p. 759.

85. Ibid., pp. 517-518.

86. Miscellaneous Records vol. 5Z 1842-1843 (Secretary of State), pp. 64-65.

87. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule IV, St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, pp. 337-338 (To determine the value of farm goods grown, the annual price of the produce must be obtained. According to Dale Evans Swan, the yearly average for agricultural produce was 65a per bushel for

sweet potatoes, 90.3t for one bushel of Indian corn, $1.01 for one hundred pounds of hay, and $1.03 per bushel for peas and beans); Dale Evans Swan, "The Structure and Profitability of the Antebellum Rice Industry: 1859" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1972), p. 285.

88. Sixth Census of the United States, 1840: Schedule I, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 189; Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1848, Record Number 13 (Charleston County), "Testimony of Jennette Collins," 27 May 1848.

89. Record of Wills vol. 44 1845-1851 (Charleston County), p. 301.

90. Inventories vol. B 1844-1850 (Charleston County), p. 385; Master of Equity, Bills of Complaint 1848, Record Number 13 (Charleston County), "Report of Edward R. Laurens," 21 June 1849.

91. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 184; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 395; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 357-358.

92. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule 1, Georgetown County, South Carolina, p. 310; Ibid., Schedule !I, n.p. (see October 22); Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 709-710; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule !, Georgetown County, South Carolina, p. 291; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 103.

93. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Georgetown County, South Carolina, p. 291; Ibid., Schedule 11, p. 103.

94. Fourth Census of the United States, 1820: Schedule I, St. Paul's Parish, Colleton County, South Carolina, p. 45; Fifth Census of the United States, 1830: Schedule I, St. Paul's Parish, Colleton County, South Carolina, p. 450; Sixth Census of the United States, /840: Schedule I, St. Paul's Parish, Colleton County, South Carolina, -p.-206.

95. Fourth Census of the United States, 1820: Schedule I, St. Paul's Parish, Colleton County, South Carolina, p. 52; Rules and Regulations of the Brown Fellowship Society, Established at Charleston, South Carolina, November 1, 1790 (Charleston: J.B. Nixon, 1844), p. 25; Miscellaneous Records vol. 5Z 1842-1843 (Secretary of State), pp. 260-261; Ibid., vol. 4B 1809-1811, p. 373; Marriage Settlements vol. 4 1801-1805 (South Carolina), pp. 128-129 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

96. Fourth Census of the United States, 1820: Schedule 1, St. Paul's Parish, Colleton County, South Carolina, p. 52; Ibid., Schedule I, Charleston Neck, South Carolina, p. 81; F.Y. Porcher, Directory and Strangers Guide for the City of Charleston for 1831 (Charleston: Irishman, 1831), p. 176; Fifth Census of the United States, 1830: Schedule I, St. Paul's Parish, Colleton County, South Carolina, p. 454; Ibid., Schedule I, Charleston Neck, South Carolina, p. 140; Sixth Census of the United States, 1840: Schedule I, St. Paul's Parish, Colleton County, South Carolina, p. 205.

97. Record of Wills vol. 44 1845-1851 (Charleston County), p. 166.

98. Charleston Courier, February 22, 1847.

99. Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. D 1847-1850 (Charleston County), pp. 274-276, 436.

100. Charleston Courier, March 12, 1847; Ibid., September 2, 1847; Ibid., November 23, 1847; Ibid., January 13, 1848; Inventories, Appraisements & Sales vol. B 1844-1850 (Charleston County), pp. 394-395; Bills of Sale vol. 6B 1846-1849 (Secretary of State), pp. 275, 357.

101. Alfred G. Smith, Economic Readjustment of an Old Cotton State: South Carolina 1820-1860 (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1958), pp. 62-63.

102. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule 1, Barnwell District, South Carolina, p. 400; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 43-44; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Barnwell District, South Carolina, p. 449; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 29-30; Ibid., Schedule I, Chester County, South Carolina, p. 85; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 53-54.

103. Register of Conveyance vol. R 1833-1839 (Newberry County), p. 156 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule 1, Newberry District, South Carolina, p. 255; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 303-304.

104. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Newberry District, South Carolina, p. 275; Ibid., Schedule Il, p. 297.

105. Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 43-44.

106. Stampp, Peculiar Institution, pp. 45-46; Eaton, Growth of Southern Civilization, pp. 27-28; Stanley Feldstein, Once A Slave: The Slaves' View of Slavery (New York: William Morrow & Company, 1971), pp. 47-49.

107. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule V, Sumter County, South Carolina, p. 656; Inventories & Sales 1858-1868 (Sumter County), pp. 216-217 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Eaton, Growth of Southern Civilization, pp. 27-28.

108. Record of Deeds vol. 2D 1847-1851 (Barnwell County), p. 34 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Barnwell District, South Carolina, p. 469; Ibid., Schedule 11, p. 963; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 273-274.

109. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Barnwell District, South Carolina, p. 363; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 363; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 177-178.

110. Ibid., Schedule I, p. 354; Ibid., Schedule 11, p. 354; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 173-174; Ibid., Schedule 1, Edgefield County, South Carolina, p. 73; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 470; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 177-178.

111. Ibid., Schedule I, Union County, South Carolina, p. 207; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 340; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 11-12.

112. Record of Wills vol. 39 1826-1834 (Charleston County), pp. 963-964; Register of Conveyance vol. F-10 (Charleston County), pp. 328-329; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1832 (Charleston); Bills of Sale vol. 50 1832-1836 (Secretary of State), p. 643.

113. Ibid., p. 643; Aitken, ed., Did Slavery Pay?, p. 218.

114. Charleston Mercury, January 1, 1839.

115. Ibid., January 7, 1839.

116. Inventories, Appraisements & Sales vol. A 1839-1844 (Charleston County), pp. 40-43.

117. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule !, St. Luke Parish, Beaufort County, South Carolina, p. 36; Ibid., Schedule t!, p. 83; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 287-288; Ibid., Schedule I, Prince

William Parish, Beaufort County, South Carolina, p. 94; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 170; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 11-12; Ibid., Schedule !, Lexington County, South Carolina, pp. 403-404; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 245; Ibid., Schedule IV pp. 27-28.

118. King, Sumter County, pp. 83, 134; Inventories & Sales 1858-1868 (Sumter County), pp. 216-217; Mariana Wikramanayake, A World in Shadow: The Free Blacks in Ante-be//um South Carolina (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1973), pp. 94-95.

119. Gregorie, Sumter County, p.-134.

120. Fourth Census of the United States, 1820: Schedule I, Sumter District, South Carolina, p. 106; Robert W. Andrews, The Life and Adventures of Capt. Robert W. Andrews of Sumter S.C. (Boston: Whitcomb, 1887), p. 26.

121. Fifth Census of the United States, 1830: Schedule !, Sumter District, South Carolina, p. 82.

122. Deeds of Conveyance vol. K 1838 (Sumter County), pp. 64-68 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

123. Michael P. Johnson and James L. Roark, Black Masters: A Free Family of Color in the Old South (New York: W.W. Norton, 1984), p. 366.

124. Miscellaneous Records vol. 1 1834-1837 (Secretary of State), pp. 505-506; Sixth Census of the United States, 1840: Schedule 1, Sumter District, South Carolina, p. 2.

125. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule !, Sumter District, South Carolina, p. 769; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 911; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 707-708; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Sumter District, South Carolina, p. 180; Ibid., Schedule!!, pp. 180-181; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 21-22; Inventories & Sales 1858-1868 (Sumter County), pp. 216-217.

126. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, St. Stephen's Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 407; Ibid., Schedule II, n.p. (see August 31); Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 361-362; Inventories, Appraisements & Sales vol. E 1857-1860 (Charleston County), pp. 370, 400, 571.

127. Record of Wills vol. 40 1834-1839 (Charleston County), pp. 266-267; Inventories, Appraisements & Sales vol. E 1857-1860

(Charleston County), pp. 972-973.

128. Record of Wills vol. 36 1818-1826 (Charleston County), pp. 985-986.

129. Inventories vol. G 1824-1834 (Charleston County), pp. 6-7; Miscellaneous Records vol. 5N 1831-1836 (Secretary of State), pp. 424-425; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule 1, St. Stephen's Parish, Charleston County, S.C., p. 405; Ibid., Schedule!!, n.p. (see August 29-30); Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 361-362; Inventories, Appraisements & Sales vol. D 1854-1857 (Charleston County), pp. 299, 440; Ibid., vol. E 1857-1860, pp. 370, 400.

130. Ibid., p. 400 (The seventeen colored farmers who owned fewer than eight slaves were Anthony Coats, Zed Chavous, Thomas Aiken, Elias Cumbo, John Conner, Jonathan Eady, Isaac Glencamp, Henry Glencamp, Charlotte Collins, Janet Collins, Stanhope Fowler, Benjamin Lewis, William Burgress, John Barr, Richard Dempsy, Lucinda Holly, and Jerry Dickey); Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Anderson County, South Carolina, p. 272; Ibid., Schedule !!, p. 19; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 117-118; Ibid., Schedule I, Barnwell County, South Carolina, p. 396; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 875; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 257-258; Ibid., Schedule !, St. James Santee Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, pp. 366-367; Ibid., Schedule!!, p. 151; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 343-344; Ibid., Schedule !, St. James & Goose Creek Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 427; Ibid., Schedule!!, p. 407; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 345-346; Ibid., Schedule I, St. Stephen's Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, pp. 405, 407; Ibid., Schedule II, n.p. (see August 29-31); Ibid., Schedule !, St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, pp. 384-385; Ibid., Schedule !I, p. 267; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 337-338; Ibid., Schedule I, Georgetown County, South Carolina, p. 305; Ibid., Schedule !I, p. 1071; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 701-702; Ibid., Schedule 1, Horry County, South Carolina, p. 42; Ibid., Schedule II, n.p. (see August 22); Ibid., Schedule 1, Orangeburgh County, South Carolina, pp. 275, 308; Ibid., Schedule!!, pp. 761, 901; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 367, 371; Ibid., Schedule !, Picken County, South Carolina, p. 505; Ibid., Schedule 11, p. 51; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 413-414; Ibid., Schedule 1, York County, South Carolina, p. 228; Ibid., Schedule Ii, p. 829 (In 1859, the following eleven colored farmers owned fewer than eight slaves: Elias Cumbo, Thomas Jefferson, Stanhope Fowler, Edward Fordham, Mary Perry, Daniel Postell, Martha Ardis, Simon Davis, Margaret Harris, Martha Williams, and John Barr); Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, St. James Santee Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 144; Ibid., Schedule !I, p. 295;

Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 327-328; Ibid., Schedule I, St. Stephen's Parish, Charleston County, p. 178; Ibid., Schedule !I, p. 385; Ibid., Schedule IV pp. 3-4; Ibid., Schedule 1, St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 184; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 395; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 357-258; Ibid., Schedule 1, Charleston Neck, South Carolina, p. 167; Ibid., Schedule !I, p. 270; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 1-2; Ibid., Schedule I, St. Paul's Parish, Colleton County, South Carolina, pp. 357, 367; Ibid., Schedule II, pp. 449, 467; Ibid., Schedule IV pp. 449-500; Ibid., Schedule I, Edgefield County, South Carolina, p. 82; Ibid., Schedule 11, p. 481; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 647-648; Ibid., Schedule I, Fairfield County, South Carolina, p. 255; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 60; Ibid., Schedule I, Georgetown County, South Carolina, p. 314; Ibid., Schedule I!, p. 134; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 13-14; Ibid., Schedule I, Orangeburgh County, South Carolina, p. 384; Ibid., Schedule !I, p. 432; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 29-30.

131. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Barnwell County, South Carolina, p. 396; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 875; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 257-258; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Edgefield County, South Carolina, p. 82; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 481; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 647-648; Ibid., Schedule I, Orangeburgh County, South Carolina, p. 384; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 432; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 29-30.

Chapter Eight: Free Black Artisans: A Need for Labor

1. Marie Ferrara Hollings, "Brickwork of Charles-Town to 1780," (M.A. Thesis, University of South Carolina, 1978), pp. 32-34.

2. Inventories vol. B 1787-1793 (Charleston County), pp. 15-16 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); A.S. Salley, Jr., ed., Register of St. Philip's Parish Charleston or Charleston, South Carolina 1754-1810 (Charleston: South Carolina Society, 1927), p. 376.

3. Inventories vol. B 1787-1793 (Charleston County), pp. 15-16.

4. Record of Wills vol. 22 1786-1793 (Charleston County), pp. 194-196 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

5. Ibid., pp. 194-195; Inventories vol. C 1793-1800 (Charleston County), p. 273; Miscellaneous Records vol. 30 1799-1800 (Secretary of State), p. 279 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

6. Record of Wills vol. 14 1771-1774 (Charleston County), p. 109; A.S. Salley, Jr., ed., Register of St. Philip's Parish Charles Town, South Carolina 1720-1758 (Charleston: Walker, Evans & Cogswell, 1904), pp. 100, 145.

7. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule 1, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 118; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 760; Leonard Price Stavisky, "The Negro Artisan in the South Atlantic States, 1800-1860: A Study of Status & Economic Opportunity with Special Reference to Charleston," (Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1958), p. 230; J.R. Honour, List of the Tax Payers of the City of Charleston for 1860 (Charleston: Walker & Evans, 1861), 315, 329; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1863 (Charleston), (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

8. Bills of Sale vol. 5A 1823-1825 (Secretary of State), p. 318 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1823, 1826, 1832 (Charleston); Bills of Sale vol. 5A 1823-1825 (Secretary of State), p. 548; Miscellaneous Records vol. 5E 1826-1828 (Secretary of State), p. 231.

9. Bills of Sale vol. 50 1832-1836 (Secretary of State), p. 519.

10. Fifth Census of the United States, 1830: Schedule !, Charleston City, South Carolina, pp. 31, 35, 39, 51, 53, 74, 92, 96, 98, 100; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1822, 1823 (Charleston County); Directory and Strangers Guide for the City of Charleston for the Year 1822 (Charleston: Schenck, 1822), pp. 106, 108; F.Y. Porcher, Directory and Strangers Guide for the City of Charleston for the Year 1831 (Charleston: Irishman, 1831), pp. 124, 125, 128; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, pp. 222, 395.

11. Sixth Census of the United States, 1840: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, pp. 21, 35, 41, 65, 73, 91; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1822, 1823 (Charleston); Directory for 1822, p. 103; T.C. Fay, Charleston Directory and Strangers Guide for 1840-1841 (Charleston, 1840), pp. 43, 61, 69; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 238.

12. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, pp. 96, 133, 153, 222, 238, 267, 278; Ibid., Schedule 11, pp. 89, 133, 825, 853, 907, 917, 937; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, pp. 281,

308, 333, 395, 430, 489; Honour, Tax Payers of the City of Charleston for 1860, pp. 320, 323, 326, 329, 330, 331; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1864 (Charleston).

13. Record of Wills vol. 43 1839-1845 (Charleston County), pp. 891-893; Bills of Sale vol. 6A 1843-1846 (Secretary of State), p. 406.

14. "Return of Deaths Within the City of Charleston from the 11th of May to the 17th of May 1851" (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule !, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 333; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 445; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule 1, Charleston City, South Carolina, pp. 133, 152, 222, 278, 279; Ibid., Schedule I!, pp. 89, 133, 825, 917 (According to the census of 1850, the following Negro carpenters owned male slaves: Richard Holloway, 38-year-old slave; Abraham Jones, 48-year-old slave; Stephen McLane, 15-year-old slave; and Joshua Mishaw, 40-year-old slave).

15. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Columbia City, South Carolina, p. 23; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 90.

16. Anne King Gregorie, History of Sumter County (Sumter: Library Board, 1954), p. 134; Fourth Census of the United States, 1820: Schedule I, Sumter District, South Carolina, p. 106; Fifth Census of the United States, 1830: Schedule I, Sumter District, South Carolina, p. 82; Sixth Census of the United States, 1840: Schedule I, Sumter District, South Carolina, p. 2; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule V, Sumter District, South Carolina, p. 656.

17. Thomas S. Sumter, Stateburg and Its People (Sumter, 1922), p. 19.

18. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule V. Sumter District, South Carolina, p. 656.

19. Business Records of William Ellison, MSS. 18 Ellison Family Papers (South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina); Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule V, Sumter District, South Carolina, p. 656.

20. William Ellison to Henry Ellison, 26 March 1857, Ellison Family Papers.

21. Record of Wills vol. E-2 1860-1867 (Sumter County), pp. 116-119 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South

Carolina); Inventories & Sales 1858-1868 (Sumter County), pp. 216-217 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); James Drayton Johnson to Henry Ellison, 9 December 1861; Sumter, Stateburg, p. 20.

22. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Sumter District, South Carolina, p. 769; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 911; Inventories & Sales 1858-1868 (Sumter County), pp. 324-325.

23. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, pp. 297, 376, 436, 468, 510; Ibid., Schedule II, pp. 439, 461, 484; Honour, Tax Payers of the City of Charleston for 1860, pp. 315, 318, 322, 324, 329; Bills of Sale vol. ST 1836-1839 (Secretary of State), p. 498; Ibid., vol. 50 1832-1836, p. 486; Ibid., vol. ST 1836-1839, pp. 1, 340, 420; Martin Robinson Delany, The Condition, Elevation, Emigration and Destiny of the Colored People of the United States (Philadelphia: Author, 1852), p. 108; Bills of Sale vol. 50 1832-1836 (Secretary of State), p. 486; Ibid., vol. ST 1836-1839, pp. 1, 134, 340, 359, 400, 420, 498; Ibid., vol. 5W 1839-1843, p. 2; Ibid., vol. 6A 1843-1846, pp. 183, 393.

24. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 284; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 921; Bills of Sale vol. 50 1832-1836 (Secretary of State), p. 210; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 384; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 267.

25. Bills of Sale vol. 6B 1846-1849 (Secretary of State), p. 526; Ibid., vol. 6C 1849-1853, p. 138; Ibid., vol. 6D 1853-1857, p. 330; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 247; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 865.

26. Bills of Sale vol. 6B 1846-1849 (Secretary of State), p. 220; Ibid., vol. 6C 1849-1853, p. 34; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 129; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 85.

27. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, pp. 83, 100, 129, 172, 221, 223, 226, 246, 251, 254, 277, 288; Ibid., Schedule II, pp. 1, 34, 85, 745, 821, 825, 829, 865, 873, 877, 913; J.H. Boggert, Directory for the City of Charleston for the Year 1852 (Charleston: Edward C. Councell, 1851), pp. 25-80; The Charleston City and General Business Directory for 1855 (Charleston: David Gazlay, 1855), pp. 100-175.

28. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule II, Charleston City, South Carolina, pp. 1, 34, 85, 745, 821, 825, 829, 873, 877, 913 (According to the census of 1850, the following colored mantua makers and seamstresses owned adult female slaves: Catherine Alston, 30-year-old slave; Eleanor Elfe, 28-year-old slave; Mary Gardner, 34-year-old slave; Charlotte Hall, 61 and 52-year-old slaves; Rose Holmes, 34-year-old slave; Rebecca Lawson, 35-, 28- and 18-year-old slaves; Caroline Lebate, 29-, 28- and 18-year-old slaves; Sally Johnson, 48-year-old slave; Mary Steedman, 24-year-old slave; Catherine Steel, 40-year-old slave; Anna Stint, 35-, 28- and 27-year-old slaves; Anna Vaughan, 43- and 39-year-old slaves; and Carolina Veree, 33-year-old slave); Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule !, Charleston City, South Carolina, pp. 260, 430, 389; Ibid., Schedule 1!, pp. 427, 463, 475.

29. Bills of Sale vol. 3X 1805-1808 (Secretary of State), p. 364; Ibid., vol. 4X 1822-1823, p. 359; Inventories vol. G 1824-1834 (Charleston County), p. 581.

30. Inventories vol. G 1824-1834 (Charleston County), p. 581.

31. Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1823 (Charleston); Bills of Sale vol. ST 1836-1839 (Secretary of State), p. 192; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule 1, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 242; Ibid., Schedule 11, p. 857; Bills of Sale vol. 50 1832-1836 (Secretary of State), p. 908; Ibid., vol. 5W 1839-1843, pp. 468, 516; Ibid., vol. 5K 1829-1832, p. 530.

32. Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. A 1838-1841 (Charleston County), p. 140 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

33. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule !, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 218; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 807; Bills of Sale vol. 5W 1839-1843 (Secretary of State), p. 408; Record of Wills vol. 50 1862-1868 (Charleston County), pp. 221-224; Bills of Sale vol. 5W 1839-1843 (Secretary of State), p. 353; Bills of Sale vol. 6A 1843-1846 (Secretary of State), p. 206; Ibid., vol. 6D 1853-1857, p. 389; Ibid., vol. 6E 1857-1863, p. 176.

34. Inventories, Appraisements & Sales vol. F 1860-1864 (Charleston County), p. 552.

35. Record of Wills vol. 50 1862-1868 (Charleston County), p. 221.

36. Ibid., p. 223; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1864 (Charleston).

37. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, pp. 127,153, 209, 218, 226, 231, 242, 255, 280,287; Ibid., Schedule II, pp. 81, 797, 806, 807, 821, 833, 857, 881, 925, 953.

38. Ira Berlin, Slaves Without Masters: The Free Negro in the Antebellum South (New York: Vintage Books, 1974), p. 237; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, pp. 307, 328, 332, 333, 375, 465, 499; Honour, Tax Payers of the City of Charleston for 1860, pp. 319, 323, 324, 326, 328, 332, 333; Directory for 1855, pp. 29, 53, 70.

39. Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1823 (Charleston); Bills of Sale vol. 5G 1827-1829 (Secretary of State), p. 148; Ibid., vol. 50 1832-1836, p. 165; Sixth Census of the United States, 1840: Schedule !, Charleston Neck, South Carolina, p. 122; Fay, Directory for 1840-1841, p. 63; Bills of Sale vol. 4M 1816-1818 (Secretary of State), p. 333; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1823 (Charleston); Bills of Sale vol. 5K 1829-1832 (Secretary of State), pp. 176, 356; Ibid., vol. 50 1832-1836, pp. 589, 590; Ibid., vol. ST 1836-1839, pp. 182, 494; Ibid., vol. SW 1839-1843, pp. 69, 106; Sixth Census of the United States, 1840: Schedule 1, Charleston Neck, South Carolina, p. 126; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule !, Charleston Neck, South Carolina, p. 315; Ibid., Schedule If, pp. 661, 797; E. Horace Fitchett, "The Free Negro in Charleston, South Carolina," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1950), p. 43; Bills of Sale vol. 5T 1836-1839 (Secretary of State), p. 549; Ibid., vol. 6A 1843-1846, p. 4.

40. Inventories vol. G 1824-1834 (Charleston County), pp. 11-13; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1823 (Charleston); Marriage Settlements vol. 11 1833-1835 (South Carolina), pp. 51-55 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Charleston Mercury, November 26, 1833; Fifth Census of the United States, 1830: Schedule !, Charleston City, South Carolina, pp. 30, 37, 53, 81, 82, 102, 119, 120; Directory for 1822, pp. 104-106; Porcher, Directory for 1831, pp. 124-128; Supplement of Charleston Directory for 1836 (Charleston: Dowling, 1836), pp. 108, 111; Fay, Directory for 1840-1841, City for 1840, p. 98, 108, 110; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, pp. 129, 145, 174, 186, 226, 286; Ibid., Schedule I!, pp. 745, 757, 829, 953; Fay, Directory for 1840-1841, pp. 98-110; Leonard Mears and

James Turnbull, The Charleston Directory and Strangers Guide for 1859 (Charleston: Walker, Evans & Co., 1859), pp. 14, 71, 85, 212, 214.

41. Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1862 (Charleston).

42. Inventories vol. G 1824-1834 (Charleston County), pp. 411-412; Direc- toryfor 1822, p. 110; Record of Wills vol. 38 1826-1834 (Charleston County), pp. 758-759; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1823 (Charleston); Bills of Sale vol. 5K 1829-1832 (Secretary of State), p. 539; Ibid., vol. 5W 1839-1843, p. 12; Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. B 1842-1843 (Charleston County), p. 247; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, pp. 403, 431, 434, 479, 492; Honour, Tax Payers of the City of Charleston for 1860, pp. 320, 321, 329, 333; Mears and Turnbull, Directory for 1859, p.,-184; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1862 (Charleston).

43. Directory for 1822, p. 105; Fourth Census of the United States, 1820: Schedule 1, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 37; Fifth Census of the United States, 1830: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 22; Bills of Sale vol. 4F 1811-1814 (Secretary of State), p. 246; Ibid., vol. 4S 1819-1820, p. 18; Ibid., vol. 4V 1820-1822, pp. 240, 255; Record of Wills vol. 40 1834-1839 (Charleston County), 289.

44. Bills of Sale vol. 4M 1816-1818 (Secretary of State), p. 337; Ibid., vol. 4X 1823-1825, p. 373; Ibid., vol. 4V 1820-1822, p. 240; Ibid., vol. 5K 1829-1832, p. 296.

45. Inventories vol. H 1834-1844 (Charleston County), p. 124.

46. Record of Wills vol. 40 1834-1839 (Charleston County), pp. 288-289.

47. Fifth Census of the United States, 1830: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 11; Bills of Sale vol. 5A 1823-1825 (Secretary of State), p. 44; Directory for 1822, p. 102; Charleston Courier, January 21, 1826; Sixth Census of the United States, 1840: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 7; Fay, Directory for 1840-1841, p. 11; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 128; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 82; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule II, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 424; Honour, Tax Payers of the City of Charleston for 1860, p. 317; Mears and Turnbull, Directory for

1859, p. 24.

48. Bills of Sale vol. 6B 1846-1849 (Secretary of State), pp. 21, 418; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 161; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 733; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1844 (Charleston); Directory for 1855, p. 53; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 180; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 749.

49. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, p. 161; Ibid., Schedule II, n.p. (see September 20).

50. Ibid., Schedule!, pp. 98, 128, 161, 180, 247, 268; Ibid., Schedule!!, pp. 29, 82, 733, 749, 865, 905.

51. Berlin, Slaves Without Masters, p. 237; Honour, Tax Payers of Charleston City for 1860, pp. 317, 321, 331; Mears and Turnbull, Directory for 1859, pp. 24, 71, 201; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1862, 1863, 1864 (Charleston).

52. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Georgetown City, South Carolina, p. 292; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 1079; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Georgetown City, South Carolina, p. 291; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 104; George C. Rogers, The History of Georgetown County, South Carolina (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1970), p. 442; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Anderson County, South Carolina, p. 257; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 165.

53. Harriett P. Simons and Albert Simons, "The William Burrows House of Charleston," South Carolina Historical Magazine vol. 70 (July 1969), pp. 169-170.

54. Ibid., p. 171.

55. St. Julien Ravenel, Charleston: The Place and the People (New York: MacMillian Company, 1906), pp. 459-461; Fourth Census of the United States, 1820: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 50.

56. Record of Wills vol. 39 1826-1834 (Charleston County), pp. 1172-1173; Inventories vol. G 1824-1834 (Charleston County), p. 581; Sixth Census of the United States, 1840: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 26; Charleston Courier, August 14, 1844.

57. Charleston Mercury, December 25, 1833; Ibid., January

30,1847; Ibid., March 1, 1845; Record of Wills vol. 36 1818-1826 (Charleston County), pp. 1008-1009; Ravenel, Charleston, pp. 459-461.

58. Miscellaneous Records vol. 5X 1839-1841 (Secretary of State), pp. 532-534; Bills of Sale vol. 5W 1839-1843 (Secretary of State), pp. 411, 414, 604.

59. Charleston Mercury, October 13, 1847.

60. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 99.

61. Ibid., Schedule II, p. 87.

62. Miscellaneous Records vol. 4Y 1822-1824 (Secretary of State), pp. 170-171; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule !, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 150; Directory for 1855, p. 95; Mortgages vol. 4B 1841-1848 (South Carolina), pp. 63-64 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Inventories, Appraisements & Sales vol. F 1860-1864 (Charleston County), pp. 394, 430.

63. Record of Wills vol. 31 1807-1818 (Charleston County), pp. 223-228; Inventories vol. E 1810-1818 (Charleston County), p. 9; Bills of Sale vol. 4S 1819-1820 (Secretary of State), p. 388; Ibid., vol. 5A 1823-1825, pp. 31, 312; Ibid., vol. SD 1825-1827, pp. 182, 183; Ibid., vol. 5K 1829-1832, p. 204; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1823, 1826 (Charleston).

64. Record of Wills vol. 28 1800-1807 (Charleston County), p. 21.

65. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, pp. 105, 144, 203; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 780; n.p. (see August 12 & September 11).

66. Inventories vol. F 1860-1864 (Charleston County), pp. 278-279.

67. Porcher, Directory for 1831, p. 123; Fifth Census of the United States, 1830: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 16; Fay, Directory for 1840-1841, p. 60; Sixth Census of the United States, 1840: Schedule 1, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 27; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule 1, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 153; Ibid., Schedule II, pp. 133, 780; Ibid.,

Schedule V, p. 149; Record of Wills vol. 45 1845-1851 (Charleston County), pp. 713-714; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 109; Ibid., Schedule 11, n.p. (see August 12); Ibid., Schedule I, Columbia City, South Carolina, p. 1; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 125.

68. Ibid., Schedule I, p. 186; Bills of Sale vol. 5W 1839-1843 (Secretary of State), p. 307; Ibid., vol. 6A 1843-1846, p. 445; Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. F 1852-1853 (Charleston County), pp. 72-75, 227-230; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule II, Charleston City, South Carolina, n.p. (see September 30).

69. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 281; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 433; Frederick A. Ford, Census of the City of Charleston, South Carolina for the Year 1861 (Charleston: Evans & Cogswell, 1861), pp. 48, 69, 74, 101, 140; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1862, 1863, 1864 (Charleston).

70. Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1862 (Charleston).

71. Kenneth M. Stampp, The Peculiar Institution: Slavery in the AnteBellum South (New York: Vintage Books, 1956), pp. 67-71; Charleston Courier, August 16, 1852; J.L. Dawson and H.W. De Saussure, eds., Census of the City of Charleston, South Carolina for 1848 (Charleston, 1849), pp. 34-35; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1844, 1850 (Charleston); Bills of Sale vol. 5W 1839-1843 (Secretary of State), pp. 453-455; Ibid., vol. 6A 1846-1849, pp. 289, 290, 292, 321, 340, 378, 388; Inventories, Appraisements & Sales vol. F 1860-1864 (Charleston County), p. 543; Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. M 1858-1865 (Charleston County), pp. 584, 585.

72. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 145; Ibid., Schedule Il, n.p. (see September 12); Mears and Turnbull, Directory for 1859, p. 212.

73. Inventories, Appraisements & Sales vol. C 1850-1854 (Charleston County), p. 229; Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. F 1852-1853 (Charleston County), pp. 72-75.

74. Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. F 1852-1853 (Charleston County), pp. 72-75, 227-230; Ibid., vol. G 1853-1854, pp. 94, 95, 181, 182, 588, 589; Ibid., vol. H 1854-1855, pp. 412, 413; Ibid., vol. 1 1856-1858, pp. 517, 578; Ibid., vol. L 1860-1861, pp. 263,

264.

75. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule !, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 226; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 833.

76. Ibid., Schedule I, p. 129; Bills of Sale vol. 5W 1839-1843 (Secretary of State), p. 461; Ibid., vol. 4V 1820-1822, p. 246; Record of Wills vol. 48 1856-1862 (Charleston County), pp. 452-453; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 133.

77. Record of Wills vol. 48 1856-1862 (Charleston County), p. 453.

78. Ibid., vol. 45 1845-1851, p. 501; Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. E 1846-1852 (Charleston County), pp. 61, 62, 301.

79. Miscellaneous Records vol. 6B 1844-1849 (Secretary of State), pp. 420-421.

Chapter Nine: The Denmark Vesey Conspiracy: Brown Masters vs. Black Slaves

1. Robert S. Starobin, ed., Denmark Vesey: The Slave Conspiracy of 1822 (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1970), p. 24; William W. Freehling, Prelude to Civil War: The Nullification Controversy in South Carolina, 1816-1836 (New York: Harper Torchbook, 1968), pp. 58-59.

2. Starobin, Denmark Vesey, pp. 21-25; Herbert Aptheker, American Negro Slave Revolts (New York: International Publishers, 1978), pp. 268-269.

3. Starobin, Denmark Vesey, pp. 19, 22, 100.

4. Ibid., p. 22.

5. Ibid., p. 20.

6. Ibid., p. 100.

7. Freehling, Prelude to Civil War, pp. 55-56; Aptheker, Slave Revolts, pp. 270-272; Michael P. Johnson and James L. Roark, Black Masters: A Free Family of Color in the Old South (New York: W.W. Norton, 1984), pp. 38-39.

8. Starobin, Denmark Vesey, pp. 41-42; Eugene D. Genovese, From Rebellion to Revolution: Afro-American Slave Revolts in the Making of the New World (New York: Vintage Books, 1981), pp. 45-46.

9. Peter H. Wood, Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina From 1670 through the Stono Rebellion (New York: W.W. Norton, 1974), pp. 59-62; David C. Littlefield, Rice and Slaves: Ethnicity & the Slave Trade in Colonial South Carolina (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1981), pp. 76-80, 92-98.

10. Journal of the House of Representatives of South Carolina 1821, Record Group 1550, Microfilm reel 28, pp. 102-103 (The Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.); Mariana Wikramanayake, A World in Shadow: The Free Black in Ante-bellum South Carolina (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1973), pp. 34-35, 45; Johnson and Roark, Black Masters, p. 31.

11. Wood, Black Majority, pp. 314-320; Aptheker, Slave Revolts, pp. 219-224; Freehling, Prelude to Civil War, pp. 56-57.

12. Record of Wills vol. 40 1834-1839 (Charleston County), pp. 238-239.

13. Bills of Sale vol. 4S 1819-1820 (Secretary of State), p. 11; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1821 (Charleston City); Miscellaneous Records vol. 5M 1830-1832 (Secretary of State), pp. 229-230; Ibid., vol. SQ 1834-1839, pp. 125-126.

14. Record of Wills vol. 36 1818-1826 (Charleston County), pp. 985-987; Inventories vol. G 1824-1834 (Charleston County), p. 6; Record of Wills vol. 41 1834-1839 (Charleston County), pp. 516-518.

IS. Johnson and Roark, Black Masters, pp. 96-97.

16. Register of St. Philip's Church 1810-1857.

17. Ibid., Register of Mesne Conveyance vol. T-9 (Charleston County), pp. 236-237 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Register of St. Philip's Church 1810-1857; Johnson and Roark, Black Masters, p. 227.

18. Directory and Stranger's Guide for the City of Charleston for the Year 1822 (Charleston: Schenck, 1822), pp. 22, 109; Fourth Census of the United States, 1820: Schedule!, St. John's Parish, Colleton District, South Carolina, p. 102; Free Negro Capitation Tax

Book 1822 (Charleston City); Directory for 1822, p. 85; Fifth Census of the United States, 1830: Schedule I. St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, Charleston District, South Carolina, p. 194.

19. Directory for 1822, pp. 24, 104; Starobin, Denmark Vesey, p. 30.

20. Starobin, Denmark Vesey, pp. 37, 133-137.

21. Robert L. Harris, "Charleston's Free Afro-American Elite: The Brown Fellowship Society and the Humane Brotherhood," South Carolina Historical Magazine vol. 81 (Summer, 1981), pp. 289-295; Rules and Regulations of the Brown Fellowship Society, Established at Charleston, South Carolina, November 1, 1970 (Charleston: J.B. Nixon, 1844), pp. 26-27; Fourth Census of the United States, 1820: Schedule 1, Charleston City, South Carolina, pp. 37, 38, 50, 60, 61; Bills of Sale vol. 5D 1825-1827 (Secretary of State), p. 50.

22. Harris, "Charleston's Free Afro-American Elite," pp. 289-292; Record of Wills vol. 30 1800-1807 (Charleston County), p. 1127; Inventories vol. D 1800-1810 (Charleston County), p. 438; Ibid., vol. G 1824-1834, pp. 411-412.

23. Miscellaneous Records vol. 4Y 1822-1824 (Secretary of State), pp. 170-171; Bills of Sale vol. 3N 1799-1805 (Secretary of State), p. 381; Register of St. Philip's Church 1810-1857; Johnson and Roark, Black Masters, pp. 209-210.

24. Bills of Sale vol. 6B 1846-1849 (Secretary of State), p. 150; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule 1, Charleston Neck, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 323; J.R. Honour, List of the Tax Payers of the City of Charleston for 1859 (Charleston: Walker & Evans, 1860), p. 383; Bills of Sale vol. 6D 1853-1857 (Secretary of State), p. 18; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Charleston City, Ward 8, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 502; Johnson and Roark, Black Masters, pp. 378-379.

25. Inventories vol. G 1824-1834 (Charleston County), pp. 74, 581.

26. (According to the inventories of Charleston County, four free blacks - Bersheba Cattle, Samuel Creighton, Joseph Martin, and Sally Seymour-owned either slaves or real estate valued at a minimum of $1,500); Inventories vol. D 1800-1810 (Charleston County), p. 438; Ibid., vol. E 1810-1818, p. 9; Ibid., vol. F 1819-1824, pp. 81-82; Ibid., vol. G 1824-1834, pp. 11-13 (The determination of complexion was

based on documents which referred to the black elite as free persons of unmixed heritage. For the most part, the term "free black" was used by whites and free Negroes to distinguish dark-skinned people from light-skinned people. For instance, Julia Cox, a free woman of Charleston, referred to herself as "a free Black woman" when she recorded her will. Her statement of color was an indication of the pride of race as well as a description of complexion. The census taker of 1850 denoted her as a free woman of dark hue and unmixed in heritage); Record of Wills vol. 1845-1851 (Charleston County), p. 896; Seventh Census of the United States 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, Ward 3, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 209; Record of Wills vol. 30 1800-1807 (Charleston County), p. 1127; Ibid., vol. 311807-1818, p. 223; Miscellaneous Records vol. 4Y 1822-1824 (Secretary of State), p. 170; Bills of Sale vol. 3N 1799-1805 (Secretary of State), p. 381. Between 1800 and 1840, Thomas S. Bonneau, Ruth Cole, Maria Derac, Susan Ann Dereef, Ruth Gardner, Mary Gotton, Joseph Hanscome, Thomas Inglis, Jehu Jones, Sr., Charlotte Kershaw, Jacob Kochler, Benjamin Lincoln, Richard Moore, William Penceel, Sarah Reids, and Lydia Watson owned property valued at a combined sum of $78,915 and were denoted as light-skinned Negroes); Inventories vol. E 1810-1818 (Charleston County), p. 431; Ibid., vol. F 1819-1824, p. 571; Ibid., vol. G 1824-1834, pp. 24-25, 44-45, 74, 422-423, 502, 581; Ibid., vol. H 1834-1844, pp. 16, 46, 109, 114-115, 124, 200, 243-244, 389; Register of St. Philip's Church 1810-1857; Rules and Regulations of the Brown Fellowship Society, pp. 26-27; Record of Wills vol. 39 1826-1834 (Charleston County), pp. 960-971; Miscellaneous Records vol. 5E 1826-1828 (Secretary of State), p. 265; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule 1, St. James & Goose Creek Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 427; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 407; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 353-354).

27. E. Horace Fitchett, "Free Negro in Charleston, South Carolina," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1950), pp. 36, 48, 93.

28. Record of Wills vol. 39 1826-1834 (Charleston County), pp. 960-962; Ibid., vol. 32 1807-1818, pp. 728-730; Ibid., vol. 42 1839-1845, pp. 452-453; Ibid., vol. 40 1834-1839, pp. 262-263; Ibid., vol. 44 1845-1851, pp. 23-24; Ibid., vol. 38 1826-1834, pp. 524-525.

29. Miscellaneous Records vol. 6B 1844-1849 (Secretary of State), p. 420.

30. Ibid., vol. 4Y 1822-1824, pp. 159-160; Bills of Sale vol. 5G 1827-1829 (Secretary of State), p. 286.

31. Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. A 1838-1841 (Charleston County), pp. 521-522 (Dept. of Archives & History, Columbia, S.C.); Bills of Sale vol. 4P 1817 (Sec. of State), p. 117; Ibid., vol. 3X 1805-1808, p. 281.

32. Miscellaneous Records vol. 3D 1792-1795 (Secretary of State), pp. 62-63.

33. Register of St. Philip's Church 1810-1857; Bills of Sale vol. 4F 1811-1814 (Sec. of State), p. 319; Ibid., vol. 5G 1827-1829, p. 345; Sara Walls, ed., "Marriages Performed by Rev. Basil Manly," The South Carolina Magazine of Ancestral Research vol. 8 (Winter, 1980), p. 3; Bills of Sale vol. 4P 1817 (Sec. of State), p. 393; Register of St. Philip's Church 1810-1857; Bills of Sale vol. 5G 1827-1829 (Sec. of State), p. 313; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1836 (Charleston City).

34. Starobin, Denmark Vesey, pp. 38, 98.

35. Starobin, Denmark Vesey, p. 26; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1821, 1822 (Charleston City); Fourth Census of the United States, 1820: Schedule I, Charleston City, Charleston District, South Carolina, p. 62; Inventories vol. G 1824-1834 (Charleston County), pp. 24-25; Bills of Sale vol. 5A 1823-1825 (Secretary of State), p. 318; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1821, 1822, 1823 (Charleston City); Bills of Sale vol. 4V 1820-1822 (Secretary of State), p. 134; Directory for 1822, pp. 102-108; Fourth Census of the United States, 1820: Schedule !, Charleston City, Charleston District, South Carolina, pp. 60-61; Bills of Sale vol. 4X 1822-1823 (Secretary of State), p. 190; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1821 (Charleston City); Fourth Census of the United States, 1820: Schedule 1, Charleston City, Charleston District, South Carolina, p. 72.

36. Starobin, Denmark Vesey, pp. 5-7; Wikramanayake, A World in Shadow, p. 150.

37. Starobin, Denmark Vesey, pp. 32, 39, 100.

38. Starobin, Denmark Vesey, pp. 17-25; Aptheker, Slave Revolts, pp. 268-272; Freehling, Prelude to Civil War, pp. 55-61.

39. Starobin, Denmark Vesey, p. 12; Vincent Harding, There Is A River: The Black Struggle for Freedom in America (New York: Vintage Books, 1983), pp. 71-72.

40. Starobin, Denmark Vesey, p. 5.

41. Ibid., p. 5.

42. Wikramanayake, A World in Shadow, p. 134.

43. Starobin, Denmark Vesey, pp. 17-28.

44. Ibid., p. 17; Johnson and Roark, Black Masters, p. 40.

45. Register of St. Philip's Church 1810-1857; Miscellaneous Records vol. 4Y 1822-1824 (Secretary of State), pp. 170-171; Mortgages vol. 4B 1841-1848 (South Carolina), pp. 63-64; Ravenel, Charleston, pp. 459-461; Charleston Mercury, October 13, 1847; Bills of Sale vol. 5D 1825-1827 (Secretary of State), p. 241; Fourth Census of the United States, 1820: Schedule I, Charleston City, Charleston District, South Carolina, pp. 38-50.

46. Sixth Census of the United States, 1840: Schedule !, Charleston Neck, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 115; Henrietta P. Jervey, ed., "The Private Register of Rev. Paul Trapier," South Carolina Historical Magazine vol. 58 (1957), p. 177; Bills of Sale vol. 6B 1846-1849 (Secretary of State), p. 186; Record of Wills vol. 49 1856-1862 (Charleston County), p. 868; Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. M 1858-1864 (Charleston County), pp. 352-353.

47. Journal of the Senate of South Carolina 1857, pp. 12, 87, 137.

48. Return of Deaths Within the City of Charleston from 14-21 March 1848 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Miscellaneous Records vol. 42 1823-1825 (Secretary of State), p. 186; Record of Wills vol. 39 1826-1834 (Charleston County), pp. 1138-1139; Bills of Sale vol. 5A 1823-1825 (Secretary of State), p. 481.

49. Journal of the Senate of South Carolina 1835, p. 43; Return of Deaths in the City of Charleston from 14-21 March 1848.

50. Bills of Sale vol. 4A 1808-1810 (Secretary of State), p. 83; Ibid., vol. 41 1813-1815, p. 164; Fourth Census of the United States, 1820: Schedule 1, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 37; Bills of Sale vol. 4V 1820-1822 (Secretary of State), p. 118; Charleston Courier, December 8, 1835.

51. Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1821, 1822 (Charleston City); Directory for 1822, p. 110; Inventories vol. G 1824-1834 (Charleston County), pp. 44-45; Ibid., vol. E 1857-1860, p. 457; Bills

of Sale vol. 4V 1820-1822 (Secretary of State), pp. 183, 225, 246; Record of Wills vol. 36 1818-1826 (Charleston County), pp. 1057-1059; Ibid., vol. 48 1856-1862, pp. 452-453; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule I, Charleston City, Ward 1, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 133 (For discussion on the class conflict between the mulatto elite and the black masses of Santo Domingo, see C.L.R. James, The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution [New York: Vintage Books, 1963], pp. 163-173).

52. David J. McCord, ed., The Statutes At Large of South Carolina Containing the Acts from 1814 to 1838 (Columbia: A.S. Johnston, 1839), pp. 194-195; Bills of Sale vol. 4X 1822-1823 (Secretary of State), p. 235; Inventories vol. G 1824-1834 (Charleston County), p. 74.

53. Minutes of the Brown Fellowship Society, Robert Scott Small Library, College of Charleston, Charleston, S.C.; McCord, Statutes at Large, p. 245.

54. Ibid., p. 245.

55. (After searching the statute books of South Carolina, there was not one law passed to allow free Negro emigrants into the state); General Assembly Petitions 1823 (10-3-1823-138), (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Journal of the House of Representatives of South Carolina 1840, p. 61.

56. Starobin, Denmark Vesey, pp. 149-151; Index to Manumission Book; Acts and Resolutions of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina Passed in December 1822 (Columbia: Daniel Faust, 1822), pp. 11-13.

57. Wikramanayake, A World in Shadow, pp. 150-153.

58. Starobin, Denmark Vesey, p. 144.

59. Ibid., p. 136; Wikramanayake, A World in Shadow, pp. 135, 144-145.

60. Starobin, Denmark Vesey, p. 34.

61. Wikramanayake, A World in Shadow, p. 140; Harding, There Is A River, p. 66.

62. Return of Deaths in the City of Charleston from 20-27 May

1821; Bills of Sale vol. 4A 1808-1810 (Secretary of State), p. 199; The Directory and Stranger's Guide for Charleston Neck for the Year 1819 (Charleston: Schenck & Turner, 1819), p. 5; Fourth Census of the United States, 1820: Schedule I, Charleston Neck, Charleston District, South Carolina, p. 75; Bills of Sale vol. 3N 1799-1805 (Secretary of State), p. 335; Ibid., vol. 3P 1800-1801, p. 467.

63. Master of Equity, Bills 1807, Number 53 (Charleston County).

64. Starobin, Denmark Vesey, pp. 2-4.

65. Wikramanayake, A World in Shadow, p. 177; Starobin, Denmark Vesey, p. 32.

66. Harding, There Is A River, p. 68.

67. Johnson and Roark, Black Masters, pp. 40-41.

68. Starobin, Denmark Vesey, pp. 133-137.

Chapter Ten: No More Black Massa

1. Charleston Courier, December 16, 1859.

2. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Sumter District, South Carolina, p. 80; Ibid., Schedule II, pp. 180-181; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 21-22; J.R. Honour, List of the Tax Payers of the City of Charleston for 1860 (Charleston: Walker & Evans, 1861), p. 324; James Drayton Johnson to Henry Ellison, 20 April 1860, Ellison Family Papers, (South Caroliniana Library, Columbia, South Carolina).

3. James Drayton Johnson to Henry Ellison, 20 April 1860, Ellison Family Papers.

4. Acts and Resolutions of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina Passed in December 1822 (Columbia: Daniel Faust, 1822), pp. 11-13; James Drayton Johnson to Henry Ellison, 20 April 1860, Ellison Family Papers.

5. Ibid.

6. James M. Johnson to Henry Ellison, 19 December 1860; James Drayton Johnson to Henry Ellison, 20 April 1860, Ellison Family Papers.

7. James Drayton Johnson to Henry Ellison, 20 April 1860,

Ellison Family Papers.

8. James Drayton Johnson to Henry Ellison, 16 September 1860, Ellison Family Papers.

9. James M. Johnson to Henry Ellison, 23 December 1859, Ellison Family Papers.

10. Charleston Mercury, November 24, 1860.

11. Ibid., November 27, 1860.

12. Charleston Courier, December 16, 1859.

13. Leon F. Litwack, Been in the Storm So Long: The Aftermath of Slavery (New York: Vintage Books, 1980), p. 17.

14. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Sumter District, South Carolina, p. 80; Ibid., Schedule II, pp. 181-182; Thomas S. Sumter, Stateburg and Its People (Sumter, 1922), pp. 11-12.

15. James L. Roark, Masters Without Slaves: Southern Planters in the Civil War and Reconstruction (New York: Norton, 1977), pp. 76-77; Inventories & Sales 1858-1868 (Sumter County), pp. 216-217 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

16. Charleston Mercury, November 26, 1862.

17. Louisa P. Weston to Henry Ellison, 23 March 1864, Ellison Family Papers; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 184; Ibid., Schedule 11, p. 395; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 337-338; Ninth Census of the United States, 1870: Schedule I, St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 512; Ibid., Schedule 11, pp. 1-2.

18. Bills of Sale vol. 6F 1862-1872 (Secretary of State), p. 27 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina).

19. Inventories, Appraisements & Sales vol. F 1860-1864 (Charleston County), pp. 394, 430.

20. Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1864 (Charleston), (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. M 1858-1865 (Charleston County), pp. 584-585 (Department of Archives & History,

Columbia, South Carolina); Free Negro Tax Book 1863 (Charleston).

21. Inventories, Appraisements & Sales vol. F 1860-1864 (Charleston County), p. 430; Bills of Sale vol. 6F 1862-1872 (Secretary of State), p. 12; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1864 (Charleston).

22. Joel Williamson, After Slavery: The Negro in South Carolina During Reconstruction 1861-1877 (New York: Norton, 1976), pp.-30-35.

23. George C. Rogers, The History of Georgetown County, South Carolina (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1970), p. 417; Anne King Gregorie, The History of Sumter County (Sumter: Library Board, 1954), p. 265.

24. J.G. Randall and David Herbert Donald, The Civil War and Reconstruction (Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company, 1969), pp. 576-577.

25. Wesley Markwood to Major E.L. Dean, 14 March 1867, Letters Sent to Georgetown, South Carolina 1867-1868, Freedmen Bureau, Record Group 105 (National Archives, Washington, D.C.).

26. R.M. Collins to Wesley Markwood, 30 June 1868, Register of Letters Received and Endorsements Sent January 1867- January 1869 vol. 190, Freedmen Bureau, RG 105.

27. Wesley Markwood to Major H. Ride, 18 July 1868, Register of Letters Received October 1867- January 1869 vol. 16, Freedmen Bureau, RG 105.

28. R.M. Collins to Wesley Markwood, 30 December 1868, Freedmen Bureau, RG 105.

29. Henry Heriot to Major Ride, 5 March 1869, Register of Letters Received January 1869- February 1870, Freedmen Bureau, RG 105.

30. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Georgetown County, South Carolina, p. 314; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 134; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 13-14; Ninth Census of the United States, 1870: Schedule 1, Georgetown County, South Carolina, p. 262; Ibid., Schedule II, pp. 86-87.

31. Eugene D. Genovese, Roll, Jordan, Rol: The World the Slaves Made (New York: Pantheon Books, 1974), pp. 3-10.

32. Tenth Census of the United States, 1880: Schedule I, Georgetown County, South Carolina, p. 407; Ibid., Schedule II, pp. 2-3.

33. Ninth Census of the United States, 1870: Schedule I, Georgetown County, South Carolina, p. 262; Ibid., Schedule II, pp. 86-87; Tenth Census of the United States, 1880: Schedule II, Georgetown County, South Carolina, pp. 2-3.

34. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 184; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 395; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 337-338; Ninth Census of the United States, 1870: Schedule I, St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, p. 512; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 1.

35. Ninth Census of the United States, 1870: Schedule II, St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish, Charleston County, South Carolina, p.l.

36. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Sumter County, South Carolina, p. 80; Ibid., Schedule !I, p. 180; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 21-22; Ninth Census of the United States, 1870: Schedule I, Sumter County, South Carolina, p. 237; Ibid., Schedule 11, p. 3; Tenth Census of the United States, 1880: Schedule I, Sumter County, South Carolina, p. 302; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 18.

37. Sumter, Stateburg, p. 20.

38. Ninth Census of the United States, 1870: Schedule I, St. Stephen's Parish, Charleston County, p. 451; Ibid., Schedule!!, pp. 1-2; Register of Planters (Beaufort County) vol. 65 1868, p. 34, Freedmen Bureau, RG 105; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, St. Luke's Parish, Beaufort County, South Carolina, p. 36; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 83; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 287-288.

39. Ibid., Schedule I, Newberry County, South Carolina, p. 275; Ibid., Schedule II, p. 127; Ibid., Schedule IV, pp. 43-44; Ninth Census of the United States, 1870: Schedule I, Newberry County, South Carolina, p. 544; Ibid., Schedule II, pp. 1-2.

40. Ibid., Schedule II, p. 1; Conveyance Records vol. S-S 1872-1874 (Newberry County), p. 234 (Department of Archives & History, Columbia, South Carolina); Tenth Census of the United States, 1880: Schedule !, Newberry County, South Carolina, p. 100; Ibid., Schedule !!, pp. 15-16.

41. Ninth Census of the United States, 1870: Schedule 1, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 546.

42. Ibid., Schedule I, p. 399.

43. Frederick A. Ford, Census of the City of Charleston, South Carolina for the Year 1861 (Charleston: Evans & Cogswell, 1861), pp. 24, 48, 50, 51, 68, 69, 72, 74, 76, 101, 104, 107, 108, 121, 157, 159, 161, 198; Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. G 1853-1854 (Charleston County), p. 378; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1864 (Charleston); Ninth Census of the United States, 1870: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, pp. 138, 139, 338.

44. Ninth Census of the United States, 1870: Schedule I, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 544.

45. Dorothy Sterling, The Making of An Afro-American: Martin Robinson Delany, 1812-1885 (New York: Doubleday, 1971), p. 279.

46. Thomas Holt, Black Over White: Negro Political Leadership in South Carolina during Reconstruction (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1977), pp. 46, 70; Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: Schedule !, Charleston Neck, South Carolina, p. 312, 346; Honour, Tax Payers of the City of Charleston for 1860, p. 329; Free Negro Capitation Tax Book 1862 (Charleston).

47. Record of Wills vol. 44 1845-1851 (Charleston County), p. 294; Guardian/Trustee/Returns: Probate Records vol. F 1852-1853 (Charleston County), p. 412; Lawrence C. Bryant, ed., Negro Senators and Representatives in teh South Carolina Legislature (Orangeburgh: Author, 1968), pp. 166-167; Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule I, Georgetown City, South Carolina, p. 291; Ibid., Schedule 11, p. 104; Rogers, Georgetown County, p. 442; Alton Hornsby, Jr., The Black Almanac (New York: Barron's Educational Series, 1977), pp. 44-45. Within the local government of Charleston City, there were several former slaveowners of African descent. These former masters were: Malcolm Brown (Alderman, Ward 6,1868); Peter Brown (delegate, Ward 3, to the Republican Convention of Charleston County in 1867); Richard E. Dereef (Alderman, Ward 5, elected as a Democrat in 1868); Elias Garden (Alderman, Ward 6, elected as a Democrat in 1871); R.H. Harney (delegate, Ward 6, to the Republican Convention of Charleston County in 1867); Richard Holloway (Alderman, Ward 4, 1868); Robert Howard (Alderman, Ward 3, 1868); John B. Morris (delegate, Ward 8, to the Republican Convention for Charleston County in 1867); George Shrewsberry (Alderman, Ward 6, 1873); and

Thomas R. Small (School Commissioner, Ward 8, 1870); Honour, Tax Payers of the City of Charleston for 1860, pp. 317, 319, 321, 323, 324, 327, 329; William C. Hine, "Black Politicians in Reconstruction Charleston, South Carolina: A Collective Study," Journal of Southern History vol. XLIX (November 1983), pp. 55-560, 573-582.

48. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Schedule 1, Charleston City, South Carolina, p. 411; Honour, Tax Payers of the City of Charleston for 1860, p. 387; Carol K. Rothrock Bleser, The Promised Land: The History of the South Carolina Land Commission, 1869-1890 (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1969), p. 76; Holt, Black Over White, p. 51.

Index

The letters f.p.c."denote free persons of color

Abbeville, S.C. 66, 130
Act (legislative): of 1800, 35, 37, 51–53, 65, 72, 163; of 1806, 7; of 1820, 35, 53–54, 62, 65; of 1822, 180–181, 188; of 1841, 65–67, 73–74
Adger, William 145
African Methodist Episcopal Church 172–173, 181, 184
Alfs, Christian 55–56
Allen, Eliza 78
Allston, Robert 107–108
Alston, Georgianna 71, 169
Alston, Thomas 71, 169
Anderson, Abigail H. 192
Anderson, Andrew James 92, 125–126, 195
Anderson, Esther (Holman) 112, 114, 115, 118–119, 127
Anderson, James 104, 119, 125, 127
Anderson, Robert W. 135
Anderson, S.C. 130, 153
Angel, Justine 166
Appomattox 22
Ardis, Martha 138–139
Austin, Samuel 142

Bacot, H.H. 181
Badges 78–79
Bago (West African tribe) 112
Baker, Mary 162
Baldwin, Robert 17, 128, 171
Ball, Alvin 155
Ball, Charles 100
Ball, Isaac 155
Ball, Nat 50
Ballam (West African tribe) 112

Bampfield, Barbara Maria 24, 89
Bancroft, Edward 71
Bar, John 139
Barbers 22, 37, 90, 140, 151–153, 169
Barnett, Samuel 39
Barnwell, S.C. 90, 103, 130–132, 138
Barquet, Barbara 94–95, 170
Barquet, Bissett 94
Barquet, Edward 94
Barquet, Thomas P. 170
Barralli, Joseph 101
Barron, Esther 169
Barron, James 169
Bass, Ellen R. 129
Bass, John 15
Bass, Milbury Eliza 15
Bass, William 15
Baxter, Amos 145
Beale, Ann (Webley) 78
Beard, Elias (nominal slave to the estate of Plowden Weston) 64, 71
Beard, Rachel (nominal slave of Samuel Weston) 64, 71
Beaufort, S.C. 38, 104, 130, 134, 154, 196
Bee, William 9
Beech Hill Plantation 109–110
Bemar, John 67
Benevolent: definition 100; interpretation 80–82, 85
Benford, Charles 72, 84
Bennett, Ned (slave of Thomas Bennett) 160, 162
Bennett, Rolla (slave of Thomas Bennett) 160–162, 174, 176
Bennett, Thomas 160, 162, 175, 182
Bentham, Ann 150
Bentham, Robert 72

Berkeley, S.C. 32
Berlin, Ira 81
Berry, John H. 132
Betty (f.p.c.) 45
Biddolph, Robert 34
Biniker, Joseph F. 132
Black, Joseph A. 58
Black River 103
Blessing Plantation 111, 114–116
Bluit, Esther 137
Boag, Sarah 104, 125–126, 195
Boat builders 83
Boatwright, James 58
Bond-Ion, Jacob 145
Bonneau, Thomas Siah 90, 98, 166, 172, 181, 185
Bontham, Richard (slave of Jacob Weston) 148
Boone, Charlotte 126
Boone, Sarah 119
Bowers, Sarah 134–135
Bradshaw, Deodotus 32
Bricklayers 15, 22, 85, 140–142
Bristol, England 113
Broughton vs. Telfer & Waterman 73
Brown, Alexander H. 95, 147
Brown, Ann (Fairfield) 78, 170
Brown, Archibald 111
Brown, Bella 46
Brown, Charlotte 46
Brown, James 82–83, 177, 181
Brown, James (nominal slave of James Brown) 82–83
Brown, Jane 101
Brown, John 25
Brown, John (nominal slave of James Brown) 82–83
Brown, Joseph S. 88
Brown, Malcolm 46, 68, 99, 149–150, 181, 197
Brown, Mary 25
Brown, Mary (daughter of Bishop Maurice Brown) 46
Brown, Maurice 46, 172, 181, 185
Brown, Morris *see* Maurice Brown
Brown, Moses 78, 90, 99, 152, 170
Brown, Peter 99, 152–153
Brown, Samuel 46
Brown, Sarah 46
Brown Fellowship Society 16, 98–99, 128, 167–168, 172, 179–180
Bryce, John 58
Bulls Head Plantation 104, 125, 195
Burke, James 150

Burrows-Hall 153
Butchers 51, 54, 75, 82, 91, 95, 151, 158, 160, 191
Buyck, Peter 34

Cabinet makers 140
Cain, Elizabeth 76
Cain, John 16
Cain, Peter 29
Calhoun, John C. 175
Camden, S.C. 192
Camden Gazette 135
Cameron, John 115
Campbell, Frederick 29–30, 153
Campbell, L.S. 60, 178
Canada 188
Caper, Thomas F. II
Carews, Edward 181
Carmand, Charlotte A. 25, 93, 197
Carmand, Francis (white) 170
Carolina (f.p.c.) 51
Carpenters 22, 37, 46, 53, 66, 71, 86, 91, 97, 140–144, 184
Carriage makers 62
Casper, William 72
Caterers 51, 140, 150
Cattel, Robert 156
Cattle, Barsheba 39
Chafee, Otis J. 152
Chanet, Anthony 104, 116–117, 119
Chapman, Sarah 33–34
Charleston Bank 124
Charleston City, S.C. 7, 11, 15, 18, 28, 30, 32, 33, 38, 71, 74, 79, 82, 105, 124, 133, 160–162, 164, 166, 168, 170; black masters 7–10, 22–23, 25–29, 39–40, 45–48, 50–54, 61, 64, 67–68, 74, 78, 84–86, 88–93, 99–102, 142, 145–147, 149–150, 151–153, 155–156, 162, 170–177, 180, 184, 188–189, 191–192, 197–198
Charleston Courier 7, 123, 129, 154, 158–161, 178
Charleston Daily Courier 198
Charleston District, S.C. 13, 19, 24, 29, 33–34, 36, 67, 86, 96, 102, 103, 104, 111–112, 115–117, 119–120, 122, 127–128, 130, 133, 137, 145–146, 161, 169, 189, 191, 196
Charleston Mercury 16, 134, 155, 159
Charleston Neck, S.C. 5, 19–20, 39, 48, 50, 52, 54, 55, 70–71, 82–83, 109, 128, 146, 149, 151, 161, 173

Charleston Saving Institution 124
Charnock, David 48
Charnock, George 173, 177
Charnock, Thomas 48
Chavous, Zed 138
Cheraw, S.C. 192
Cherry Hill Plantation 77, 169
Chester, S.C. 130
Chesterfield, S.C. 130, 192
Chichestor, John 52
Chisolm, Andrew 130
Chisolm, Betsey 130
Chion, John Francis 88
Chopein, Lewis 118
Christ Church Parish 41
Chyhaw, S.C. 32
Civil War 18, 118, 126, 145, 153, 187, 189, 191–192, 195–197
Clarendon, S.C. 130
Clarke, France A. 12
Clarke, Lucretia 33
Clarke, William 12, 145
Cochran, Samuel 165
Cogdell, Richard 155
Cohen, Jacob 71, 120–121
Cohen, Philip 90
Cole, Ruth 24, 166
Cole, Sarah 89, 177
Cole, Thomas 15, 19, 142
Cole, Thomas (son) 143
Colleton, S.C. 20, 66, 103–104, 109–110, 128
Collins, Charlotte (daughter of Robert Collins, white) 119
Collins, Charlotte (daughter of Robert Collins, f.p.c.) 126
Collins, Elias 10–11, 104, 107–108, 119–121
Collins, Elizabeth (Holman) 112, 114–115, 118, 120–121, 125, 127
Collins, Elizabeth (nominal slave of Robert Hume, etc.) 120–121
Collins, Esther 119
Collins, Gasham 119
Collins, Jeanette 87, 127, 195
Collins, Jonathan 87, 119, 127
Collins, Jonathan G. 120–121
Collins, Margaret (Holman) 112, 114–115, 119, 126–127
Collins, Martha (daughter of Robert Collins, f.p.c.) 126
Collins, Martha (daughter of Robert Collins, Jr.) 158
Collins, Nelly (Fowler) 41, 87, 127

Collins, Nelly (daughter of Robert Collins, white) 119
Collins, Rachael 119
Collins, Rebecca 119
Collins, Robert (f.p.c.) 92, 104, 119, 126–127
Collins, Robert (white) 119, 126, 165
Collins, Robert, Jr. 108, 120–121, 126, 158
Collins, Robert Michael 1, 104, 120–121, 126, 192–195
Collins, Sarah (daughter of Robert Collins, Jr.) 158
Columbia, S.C. 57, 59, 61, 157, 163
Confederate Army 190–192
Conner, John 137
Conner, Sarah 138
Conrad, Alfred 123
Cooper, Thomas J. 99
Cooper, William 66–67, 99, 149, 167, 177
Cooper, William Garden (nominal slave of Thomas Lehre) 67
Cooper River 103, 111, 114, 116
Cornwell, Amelia L. 29, 192
Corr, Charles 172
Cotton 1, 102, 130–137, 140, 144, 190, 195–196; cultivation 131–132
Cotton gin makers 36, 140, 144–145
Cotton, James 119
Cox, Julia 50, 90
Creighton, George 169, 184
Creighton, Samuel 168
Cross, George W. 166
Cumbahee River 103
Curry, Leonard P. 6

DaCosta, Joseph Hanscome 96
DaCosta, Louisa Rebecca 22, 168
DaCosta, William P. 22, 96, 145, 168
DaCoster *see* DaCosta
Dambia River (West Africa) 113
Darison, Tobias 68
Darlington, S.C. 130, 192
Dawson, A.V. 27
Dearington, Hannibal 40
Dearington, March 40, 93
Dearington, Thomas 40
Deas, Ann 154
Delany, Martin 197
DeLarge, John 148, 198
DeLarge, Robert 198

Derac, Maria Rose 89, 179
Derac, Mary Louisa 89
Dereef, Isabella (Fowler) 41
Dereef, Joseph 16, 78, 98, 197
Dereef, Joseph W. 150
Dereef, Richard E. 16, 67, 73, 83, 95
Dereef, Susan Ann 95
Desportes, Peter 88
Desverneys, Peter 19, 30, 42, 57, 156, 174, 178–179
Devand, Henry (slave of Jacob & Samuel Weston) 8, 148
Dewee, John Francis 95
Dewee, William Edward 95
Dewees, William, Jr. 181
Doars, Elias 122
Donatto, Auguste 1
Dorrill, Edward R. 157
Doughty, William 32
Douglass, John (nominal slave of George & William McKinlay) 54
Douglass, Rebecca (nominal slave of George & William McKinlay) 54–55
Draymen 3, 94, 156
Drayton, Henry 172
Drayton, John 143
Duchill, Jacob 130
Dunkin, Benjamin 56
Dupie, Julia 142
Dwight, Eliza 150, 166
Dwight, Isaac Broughton 32

Eady, Daniel 11, 137
Eady, Jonathan 137–138
Eady, Susannah 138
Easterling, J.B. 122
Eaton, Clement 123
Eckells, William 110
Edgefield, S.C. 130, 133, 138–139
Edward, Edward H. 96, 133
Edward, Sarah 172, 185
Eggart, Julia *see* Juliet Eggart
Eggart, Juliet 93–94
Elliott, Bernard 40
Ellison, April *see* William Ellison
Ellison, Henry 144–145, 188, 190–191, 196
Ellison, Maria 62
Ellison, Reuben 144–145
Ellison, William 1, 37–38, 62, 132, 136, 144–145, 190, 195
Ellison, William (white) 135

Ellison, William, Jr. 144–145
Elwig, Amelia 46–47
Elwig, Joseph 47, 67, 70
Elwig, Peter 46–47, 51, 67, 70
Elwig, Rebecca 70
Emancipation Proclamation 18, 151, 190
Emanuel, Nancy 8
Espinard, Jeremiah L. 61–62
Evans, Friday 143

Fairfield, S.C. 37, 62, 130, 138
Fanning, Thomas 151
Fenwick, Susan 39
Fergusson, Jerry 156
Fishermen 23
Florence, Louise 25
Florida 1
Forrest, Aberbeen 183
Forrest, Ann 25
Fowler, Becky 41
Fowler, John 41
Fowler, Michael 41
Fowler, Stanhope 41, 145
Francis, Ann 96, 150
Francis, Hannah *see* Ann Francis
Francis, Henry 145
Francis, John 49
Francis, John L. 17, 78, 153, 177, 192, 197
Franklin, John Hope 81, 89
Free Indians 16–17, 128
Freedmen's Bureau 192, 196
Friday, Alicia 151
Friday, William, Jr. 151
Frost, Florian H. 198
Frost, Lydia 90, 198
Fuller, Sarah G. 147

Gadsden, Martha 46
Gamage, Edward 155
Gamage, Esther 155
Gambia (West Africa) 103
Garden, Elias William 15, 25, 29
Garden, Elizabeth (Hanscome) 88, 168
Garden, Elizabeth Susan 14–15, 129, 141, 168
Garden, Flora 17, 128
Garden, Henrietta (Mitchell) 16, 25

Garden, John 16, 91, 104, 128–129, 168
Garden, John George 20, 96, 129, 168
Garden, Martha Juliet 98
Garden, Ruth 27, 129, 166
Gardiner, George 15, 17, 128, 141–142
Gardiner, John 33
Gardiner, Rachel 14
Gardiner, Ruth (Raper) 15, 128
Gardner, Elias 151
Gardner, Mary Ann 146–147
Garner, William (slave) 160
Gell, Monday (slave) 161, 174, 176
Genovese, Eugene 194
Georgetown, S.C. 10, 26, 28, 38, 45, 92, 103–104, 116, 122, 124, 127–128, 153, 162, 192–195
Georgia 22, 45, 114
Gervais, John Lewis III, 114
Gettysburg, Pa. 191
Gibbes, Robert R. 93
Gibson, Gideon 12
Gibson, Gideon, Jr. (son) 12–13
Gilbertson, James 31
Gilchrist, Martha 150
Gilliens, David 62
Glencamp, Becky 27
Glencamp, Henry (f.p.c./son) 138, 165, 196
Glencamp, Henry (white) 29, 138
Glencamp, Isaac 27, 138, 165
Glencamp, Rebecca 138
Goldin, Claudia Dale 7
Gonzalez, Basilo 75
Gonzalez, Hannah 75
Gordon, Alex 75
Gordon, C.P. 54
Gordon, James 143
Gowan, Peter 147
Graham, Fanny 165, 173
Graham, Hugh 144
Grant, Alfred 145
Grant, Frances M. 129
Grant, William 192
Gray, David (slave of Thomas Inglis) 151
Gray, James W. 121
Green, Jacob 156
Green, James F. 75
Green, Mary 156
Greenville, S.C. 130
Gregorie, Aberdeen 52
Gregorie, Elizabeth 52
Gregorie, James 52
Gregorie, Titus 46–47, 52

Groning, Simon 156
Guerand, Benjamin 34
Guignard, Green 143–144
Guignard, James 58
Guinea (West Africa) 103, 111

Hall, George Abbot 112
Hamilton, Jesse 130
Hamilton, Thomas 153
Hammett, Bacchus (slave) 175
Hanscome, Elizabeth *see* Elizabeth (Hanscome) Garden
Hanscome, James 86–87, 96
Hanscome, Joseph 133–134
Hanscome, Louisa Rebecca *see* Louisa Rebecca DaCosta
Hanscome, Martha (Inglis) 168
Hanscome, Mary *see* Mary (Hanscome) Lee
Hanscome, Thomas 29, 96, 168, 170
Hanscome, Thomas (son) 20–21, 168
Hargrave, Robert 150
Harleston, Katy Ann 67–68
Harper, William 12, 14, 65, 73, 75
Harpers Ferry 25
Harris, Christiana 138
Harris, Margaret (Mitchell) 1, 28, 104, 120–122, 124–125
Harris, Randal 92, 121
Harrison, Carolina 32
Harrison, James 32, 99, 108
Harrison, John 99
Harrison, Nancy 78
Harth, Mingo (slave) 161, 174
Hawie, Tissey 48, 185
Hayne, Robert 175
Hazel, James 130
Hazel, John 130
Hazel, Joseph 130
Hazel, Mary 130
Heckimath, Leon 98
Henry, Charles 54, 173
Hermitage Plantation 104, 128–129
Herriot, Henry F. 194
Herriot, John G. 136
Hersman, J. 148
Hetty, Hannahan 150
Heyward, Duncan Clinch 106
Heyward, Nathaniel, Jr. 154
Hickory Hill Plantation 126
Hill, Martha 14
Hill, Rose 192

Hillegas, Celeste 146
Hillegas, James 146
Hinds, January 85
Hiring out 2, 7–8, 27, 34, 36, 39, 43, 94, 157–159
Hodges, Robert 35
Holland, Edwin C. 7, 182
Holloway, Charles 143
Holloway, Elizabeth (Collins) 92–93, 157–159
Holloway, Richard 71–72, 84, 99, 143, 167, 177
Holloway, Richard, Jr. (son) 143, 172
Holloway, Samuel D. 93
Holman, Elizabeth *see* Elizabeth (Holman) Collins
Holman, Esther *see* Esther (Holman) Anderson
Holman, John 110–115, 119, 126
Holman, John, Jr. (son) 104, 112–119, 127
Holman, Margaret *see* Margaret (Holman) Collins
Holman, Mary 34
Holman, Richard 115
Holman, Samuel 112–119, 127, 167
Holman, Samuel, Jr. (son) 118
Holman, William 113, 115
Holmes, Alexander 128
Holmes, John Bell 34
Holmes, William 149
Holton, Elizabeth 150
Holton, John (white) 170
Holton, Mary 150
Holwell, Maria 192
Hopton, Abby 61
Hopton, John 11
Horlbeck, Nero 143
Horry, Elias 67
Horry, Harriet Pinckney 10
Horry, S.C. 130
Howard, Harriet L. 61
Howard, Robert (f.p.c.) 157, 197
Howard, Robert (white) 61
Howie, William 93
Huger, Benjamin T. 99, 147, 149
Huggins, Robert 122
Hulbion, Harriet 148
Humes, Robert 71, 120–122
Humes, Thomas 129
Humphries, Joseph 90, 94, 99
Humphries, Margaret C. (Barquet) 94–95
Hunt, Benjamin 37

Inglis, Claudia Angelina 88
Inglis, Helen 8
Inglis, Martha *see* Martha (Inglis) Hanscome
Inglis, Martha Sophia 21, 152
Inglis, Thomas 99, 151–152, 167, 169–170, 177
Inglis, William, Jr. 152–153
Irvine, Moses 33, 38, 59–60, 172
Irving, James 32
Isle de Los 110–111
Ivory Coast (West Africa) 103

Jack, Gullah (slave) 161–162, 174
Jackson, Abraham 89
Jackson, Henry 171
Jackson, John 93
Jackson, Luther P. 81–82
Jackson, Peter 134
Jackson, Rebeca 25, 171
Jackson, Thomas 34
Jackson, William (f.p.c. of Charleston City, S.C.) 145
Jackson, William (f.p.c. of Colleton, S.C.) 66
Jacobs, Henry 62
James Island 161
Jenkins, J.D. 83
Jesszup, Priscilla 66
Johns Island 175
Johnson, Allen 149
Johnson, Camilla 91, 150
Johnson, Dye (nominal slave to the estate of George Mathews) 76
Johnson, Edward 174
Johnson, James Drayton 78–79, 147, 149, 188, 197
Johnson, James M. (son) 188
Johnson, Sally 54, 91–92
Johnson, Sarah *see* Sally Johnson
Jones, Abraham 51
Jones, Elizabeth Maria 89
Jones, Jehu 147, 153–154, 167, 169, 177, 181
Jones, Jehu, Jr. (son) 89, 99
Jones, Mary 50
Jones, Thomas 78
Jones, William 134, 196
Jones' Inn 153–155, 174, 181
Josey (f.p.c.) 48
Joyner, Cato W. (nominal slave of Richard E. Dereef) 68

Judah, John (nominal slave of Andrew Hasill) 74–75

Keckely, Conrad 86
Kelly, Margaret 25
Kennedy, Lionel H. 182
Kentucky 1
Kerhaw, Charlotte 90
Kershaw, S.C. 130
Kinlock, Benjamin 146
Kinlock, Jennette Sophia 97, 173
Kinlock, Richmond 97, 99, 145–146, 173
Kinsey, Lewis 132–133
Kird, Alex 58
Kochler, Jacob 25
Kochler, Mary 25
Kohn, Frederick 42
Knight, Thomas 56

Labaussay, Peter 149
Lacomb, Seraphine 74
Ladson, Mary Ann 14
Lamboll, Steward 78
Lancaster, S.C. 130, 192
Langlois, Antoinette 98
Langlois, Joseph 166
Laurens, Edward R. 87, 127
Laurens, Henry 13, 111
Laurens, Henry, Jr. (son) 115
Laurens, S.C. 130
Lawrence, Benjamin 143
Lawrence, Charles 49
Lawrence, George 49
Lee, Charlotte 168
Lee, Edward 153, 168
Lee, Eliza (Seymour) 39, 154–155, 168, 177
Lee, Elsey 19, 150
Lee, James 50
Lee, John 49, 99, 154–155, 168, 177, 188
Lee, John Jr. (son) 168
Lee, Robert E. 22
Leggs Plantation 109
Lehre, Thomas 67
Lemar, Charles 99
Lesense, Hannah 46
Levy, Jacob C. 147
Lewis, Nancy 138
Lexington, S.C. 130, 134, 192

Liberia (West Africa) 103
Linam vs. Johnson 65, 72
Lincoln, Abraham 18, 151, 190, 192
Lincoln, Benjamin 89, 173
Lincoln, Sarah 159
Liverpool, England 112–113
Logan, Aaron 194
Logan, E.M. 23
Logan, Edward 19–20
Logan, Frank 128
Logan, Jane 128
Logan, John Martin 86
Logan, Sarah Ann 74
London, England 113
Long, Florian H. 90
Louisiana 1, 3
L'Ouverture, Toussaint 179–180
Lowndes, Allen 67
Lowndes, Thomas 49
Lucas, George 70–71
Lucas, Georgiana 70–71
Lucas, Jonathan 122
Lucas, Josephine 71
Lucas, Martha 70–71
Lubet, Caroline 46

Mackey, Eliza 86
McBeth, John 99, 143
McCall, Emma 150
McCall, Joseph P. 94, 156
McCall, Mary Ann 159
McCloud, Cato 150
McCreighton, William 37, 62, 135
McDonald, William B. 120
McIntoish, Bess 50
McIntoish, Esther 125
McKee, Adel 72
McKenzie, Elizabeth 54
McKenzie, Hannah *see* Henrietta McNeil
McKenzie, Patience 86
McKinlay, George 54, 149
McKinlay, William 54–55, 149
McKinney, Peter 52
McLane, Stephen 143
McNeil, Henrietta 159, 171
McNeill, Daniel 110–111, 113
McNellage, Eliza 92
McQueen, John 51
McPherson, Sarah 63
Magwood, Charles W. 54
Magwood, Robert 39

Manigualt, Peter 25
Mannell, Sylvia 171
Mantua Makers 22, 140, 146
Manumission: of slaves 31–34, 38–39, 42, 51; policy 33, 35–36, 51, 53, 57; restrictions 51–54, 163; de facto freedom 52–53, 60–68, 72–73, 82–83; petitions 57–60, 66; by deed 32–33; by will 31–32, 36–37
Marion, Francis 33
Marion, John 75
Markwood, Wesley 195
Marlboro, S.C. 130
Marsh, James Hopton 61
Martin, Hannah (Morrison) 172
Martin, James 35
Martin, Mary D. 14–15
Martin, Sally *see* Sally (Martin) Seymour
Martin, Thomas 38
Maryland 1, 3
Mathews, George 37, 53–54, 75–76, 143, 165
Mathews, Henry 156
Mathews, Isaac 156
Mathews, John B. 68
Mathews, Martha Ann 37, 165
Mathews, Peter B. 18–19, 90, 143
Mathews, Sam *see* Simon Mathews
Mathews, Simon 76, 143
Maxwell, James 99, 143
Maxwell, Joseph 23
Maxwell, Theresa 192
May, Ann 90
Mazyck, William 107
Memminger, Christopher Gustavious 189
Merchant, Peter H. 20
Meyers, John R. 123
Mick, Edward 68
Miles, George 91
Miles, Hannah 86, 88
Miles, James 86
Miller, Stephen D. 136
Millwrights 22, 36–37, 43–44, 91, 140, 145–146, 197
Mishaw, Francis 67
Mishaw, John 149
Mishaw, Robert 29, 170
Mississippi 1
Missouri 1
Mitchell, Ann 16
Mitchell, James 16, 167
Mitchell, John 45

Mitchell, Margaret *see* Margaret (Mitchell) Harris
Mitchell, William N. 57
Mondaze, Julia 89
Monk vs. Jenkins 65, 73, 75
Moore, Maria (Chapman) 50
Moore, Richard 24–25, 177
Mooting, George 197
Morris family 9
Morrison, Hannah *see* Hannah (Morrison) Martin
Morton, Joseph 95, 156
Morton, Joseph McKenzie (son) 94
Morton, Patience McKenzie 94
Moses, Levy 82
Moses, Simon 91
Muckinfuss, George 64–65
Muckinfuss, Henry 64–65
Mulattoes: assimilation 12–17; blacks vs. 30, 164, 168–171, 197–198; color consciousness of 167–169; marriages among 168–169; percentage of Afro-American masters 29; as slaveholders 109–127, 141–159; wealth & property 169–170; and whites 164–167
Murley, Hamlet 156
Murrow, William 99
Mushington, William 99
Myers, John 87

Nelson, John 192
Nelson, Peter 153
Newberry, S.C. 130, 196
New York 1
Noisette, Alexander 75
Noisette, Celestine 75
Noisette, Margaret 75
Noisette, Philip Stanislas 75, 79
Nominal slaves: community life of 69–79; confidence of 70–71, 74; restrictions 76–77; wealth & property 75
Norman, Hannah *see* Hannah Miles
North, Edward 41, 79
North, Priscilla 64–65
Northhampton Plantation 120–121
Northrop, Fanny 191
North Santee River 104

Oliver, John 149
Olmsted, Frederick Law 108

Orangeburgh, S.C. 76–77, 130–139, 192, 198
Ormond, John 112–113

Palmer, Edward 142
Palmer, Nancy 138
Panis, Christopher 63
Parker, George 104, 116–117
Parker, Samuel 104
Parker, Thomas 14
Parlar, Peter 48
Parlar, Rebecca 48
Pastry cooks 22, 37–38, 140, 150–151, 158
Patterson, George 58–59
Patterson, James 58–59
Patterson, Mary 58–59
Patterson, Sally 58–59
Patton, Joseph 150
Paul, William (slave) 42, 174
Peagler, Daniel 30
Peagler, James 28
Peagler, Margaret 108
Pee Dee River 104
Penceel, Charles 180–181
Penceel, William 23, 30, 167, 174, 176, 177, 179–181
Pendarvis family 13–14, 108–110
Perrier, Francoise 159, 179
Perry, Ann 110
Perry, Francis 142
Perry, Samuel 13
Petique, James 49
Petitions: against f.p.c. 181–182; by f.p.c. 57–60, 180–181
Philadelphia, Pa. 21
Phillips, Ulrich 122
Picken, S.C. 130
Pickens, Francis W. 190
Pinckney, Elias 122
Pindiam *see* Pendarvis family
Pine Hill Plantation 29
Planters & Mechanic Bank 124
Pleasant Hill Plantation 104, 126
Plumeau, Alexander 197
Plumeau, Carolina 94–95, 170
Plumeau, John Francis 94, 197
Poincignon, E. 43
Pon Pon River 104
Population: decline of Afro-American masters 19–22; decline of slaves held by slaves 21–22; increase of Afro-

American masters 18–20; increase of f.p.c. 34–35, 53; increase of slaves held by f.p.c. 21
Porcher, Peter 67
Porcher, Philip J. 67
Porte, Eliza 49, 192
Porte, John 48–49
Porte, Mary 49
Powell, James 57
Powell, James, Jr. (son) 57
Poyas, Peter (slave) 161, 174, 176
Prince, George 149
Prince William Parish 134
Prioleau, J.C. 30, 42, 174, 176
Prioleau, Thomas G. 78
Pritchard, William 149
Prosser, Gabriel 163
Purse, Thomas F. 65, 76
Purse, William 192

Quarles, George 133

Rabb, Jesse 157
Rainey, Edward 153, 198
Rainey, Joseph 153, 198
Ralston, Sarah 154
Randall, Margaret 63
Randall, Nancy 29, 96, 168
Rankins, David 82
Raper, Susanna (Cole) 15, 141
Raper, William 15, 141
Regulator Movement 12–13
Relationship with: slaves 41–44, 164, 167–168, 171–172; whites 12–15, 164–167, 182
Remoussin, Tissey 173
Revolutionary War 33, 103, 141
Reynolds, B. 83
Ricard, Madame Ciprien 1
Ricard, Pierre 1
Rice: cultivation 104–106; factors 106–107; planters 109–129; slave labor needed for 102, 104–106; slave life 107–108
Richardson, Ann 69, 71
Richardson, James 46–47, 51
Richardson, James, Jr. (son) 47
Richardson, Nelson 71
Richland, S.C. 25, 38, 130, 143, 192
Richmond, Va. 163

Rio Pongo River 111, 113
Rio Pongo (West Africa) 112, 116, 118
Roberts, Benjamin 153
Robertson, Susan B. 84
Roche, Edward 149
Rollins, Frances 198
Rollins, William 157, 198
Rouchefoucault-Liancourt, Duke de la 13-14
Rural free blacks: cotton planters 130-136; non slaveowners 130; rice planters 109-129; small farmers 137-139
Russell, Mary 59, 172
Rutledge, Frederick 10
Rutledge, Frederick, Jr. (son) 10
Ryan, John S. 192
Ryan, Thomas 124

Sabinah (f.p.c.) 40
St. Andrews Parish 34
St. Bartholomews Parish 13, 32, 34
St. James & Goose Creek Parish 27, 29, 55, 76, 88, 96, 103, 133, 137, 169
St. James Santee Parish 10, 37, 103, 167
St. John's Berkeley Parish 11, 57, 103, 137
St. John's Parish 48, 166
St. John's Protestant Episcopal Church 166
St. Luke's Parish 134
St. Luke's Protestant Episcopal Church 166
St. Mark, Francis 153
St. Mark, John 88
St. Mark's Protestant Episcopal Church 166
St. Michael's Protestant Episcopal Church 12, 166
St. Paul's Parish 13, 47, 89, 91, 128
St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church 166
St. Philip's Protestant Episcopal Church 166-167
St. Stephen's Parish 28-30, 103, 108, 137-138, 165, 196
St. Stephen's Protestant Episcopal Church 166
St. Thomas & St. Dennis Parish 11, 24, 34, 87, 92, 98, 103-104, 119-120, 126-127, 145, 165-166, 183, 195

Sally (f.p.c.) 88
Sampit River 103
Sanders, Alfred (slave of Peter Desverneys) 42, 177
Sanders, Laviana (slave of Peter Desverneys) 19, 42–43, 177–178
Sanders, Wade 130–131, 196
Santee Plantation I, 104–108, 122–124, 193
Santee River 103–104, 116
Santo Domingo 89, 162, 175, 179, 183
Sarah (f.p.c.) 47
Saraydar, Edward 133
Sasportas, Frederick C. 145–146
Sasportas, Joseph A. 151, 191, 198
Sasportas, Thaddeus 198
Saunders, George 12
Savage, Richard 86
Schmidt, J.W. 14–15
Scott, Benjamin F. 83
Seamstresses 22, 29, 37, 39, 91, 140, 146
Secession Crisis: response by f.p.c. 188–190; threat to f.p.c. 78–79, 187–188
Sengal (West Africa) 103
Seymour, Charlotte *see* Charlotte (Seymour) Lee
Seymour, Elizabeth *see* Elizabeth (Seymour) Lee
Seymour, Mary (Warren) 168
Seymour, Sally (Martin) 38–39, 150, 168, 177
Seymour, William W. 99, 155, 168, 171, 191
Sheppard, John 95
Sherman, William T. 192
Shoemakers 22, 37, 46, 91, 140, 146–150
Shrewsberry, George 86–88, 151, 158, 198
Shrewsberry, Louisa 78
Sierra Leone (West Africa) 103–104, 110–112
Silver Bluff 40
Simmon, William 47
Simmons, Edward 50
Simpson, Peter 142
Simpson, Smart 54, 143
Singleton, Margaret 88
Singleton, Richard 88
Slaves: boarding with f.p.c. 5–7; buying and selling 6, 8–9, 20–23, 25, 39–52, 54, 58–64, 67–75, 82–86, 88–91,

95–98, 101, 104, 119, 124, 126, 129, 132–134, 138, 142, 145–152, 156–159, 171, 173, 178–179, 180, 191–192; economic need for 38–40, 102, 104–106, 130–131, 139–159; emancipation of 31–40, 53, 63–64; runaway 91–93
Small, Richard 143
Small, Thomas 91, 142–143
Small, Thomas D. (son of Thomas R. Small) 60
Small, Thomas R. (son of Thomas Small) 68, 143
Smith, Albert 86
Smith, Carlos 101, 156
Smith, Francis 149
Smith, Mary 42
Smith, Mary Ann 85
Smith, Thomas, Jr. 13
Smith, Thomas Young 45, 96
Snelling, Ann 50, 185
Snipe, Elizabeth 152
Snowden, Sarah Ann 150
South Carolina Gazette 162
South Fork River 103
Spartanburgh, S.C. 56, 130
Stable keepers 3, 156–157
Stampp, Kenneth 123
Stateburg (Sumter), S.C. 62, 135, 192
Stevens, Jerry 76–77
Stevens, Lamb 27, 55–56, 67, 76–77, 169–170, 185
Stevens, William Brown 166
Stevens vs. Alfs 56
Stock, Margaret 172
Stoll, Smart 64
Stono Rebellion 163
Sugar cane 1
Summers, Rose 84–85
Summers, Sarah M. 172
Sumter, S.C. 1, 38, 62, 130, 135, 144–145, 188, 190–192, 196
Sumter, Thomas S. 136, 190
Swan, Dale Evans 123
Swift, William 93
Swinton, Rebecca 23

Tailors 22, 37, 64, 94, 140, 146–149, 188
Tardiff, William 83–84
Taylor, Abram 63
Taylor, B.F. 58
Taylor, Elizabeth 63

Taylor, John 50
Tavel, Frederick 117–118
Terry, Joseph 149
Thomas, Daria 133
Thomas, Hector 91
Thomas, James Hamilton 40
Thompson, George 22
Thorne, John S. 33
Thorne, Rebecca 33
Thorne, Rebecca (daughter) 147
Troup, Eliza 85
Tunno, Maria (slave of Richard Holloway, Sr.) 72
Turner, Philida 39

Union Army 22, 149, 191
Union, S.C. 133
Upton Plantation 133

Vanderhorst, Martha 150, 158
Vesey, Denmark: Free Negro elite compared to 182–186; insurrection led by 7, 30, 42, 57, 60, 160–164, 172–176
Vesey, Joseph 183
Virginia 1

Waccamaw River 103
Wagner, Samuel 72
Walker, Ann (Jones) 40–41, 79
Walker, Betsey 150–151
Walker, Charles 149–192
Walker, John 40–41
Wallace, Andrew 58
Walnut Plantation 110, 133–134
Warhaim, Mary 90, 152
Waring, Daniel J. 166
Washer women 3, 94
Washington, George 163
Watson, Lydia 78, 97
Webb, Mathew 95
Wells, Moses 171
Wells, Philis 87–88
Wells, Rachel 173
West Africa 2, 111–112, 116, 183–184
Westcoat, William 129
Weston, Anthony 5, 37, 43, 44, 75, 145, 197

Weston, Francis 74
Weston, Jacob 8, 29, 61–62, 148–149
Weston, John 83, I51, I68
Weston, Lydia 36–37, 78
Weston, Maria 6, 44, 75, 91, 145, 197
Weston, Plowden 36, 43–44, 64, 74–75
Weston, Samuel 64, 71, 79, 148–149
Weston, Sarah H. I47
Weston, Toney *see* Anthony Weston
Whipper, James I98
White, Thomas 15
Whiting, Elizabeth Melrose 159
Whitney, Eli 132
Whitten, David O. 109, 123
Wigfall, Joseph 33
Wigfall, Paul 142
Wightman, Jane (Provost) 25, 170
Wightman, William 170
Wilkie, Ann 91
Wilkinson, Francis L. 151, I58, 192
Wilkinson, Lucy 93
Wilkinson, Selina I58, I91–I92
Williams, James I49
Williams Joseph 44, 91

Williamsburgh, S.C. 130, 198
Wilson, Alexander 34
Wilson, George (alias George Watkins) 60, 178–179
Wilson, James C. 29
Wilson, Jenny 29
Wilson, Joshua 54
Wilson, Margaret 47
Wood, Peter 103
Wood dealers 157
Woodland Plantation 108, 133–134
Woodson, Carter G. 11, 80–86, 94, 97, 99
Wragg, Dick 156
Wright, James 45
Wright, Sarah 45

Yonge, David 47
Young, John Peter 142

Zamie (f.p.c.) 183